

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1892.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "GAMMER GURTON'S NEEDLE."

THE first printed edition of "Gammer Gurton's Needle," the second English comedy, was issued in 1575, and as the title-page of this edition has an important bearing on the question of authorship, it is well to reproduce it here in its original form. This title-page runs as follows:

"A Ryght Pithy, Pleasaunt, and Merie Comedie:
Intytuled
GAMMER GURTON'S NEEDLE:
Played on Stage, not long ago in Christes College in
Cambridge.
Made by Mr. S. Master of Art.
Imprented at London in Fleetestreat, beneath the
conduit, at the signe of S. John Evangelist,
by Thos. Colwell.
1575."

The play was first attributed to John Still in Baker's 'Biographia Dramatica' (vol. ii, p. 691 f.¹). This work was originally compiled to the year 1764 by David Erskine Baker, was continued thence to 1782 by Isaac Reed, and was brought down to the end of Nov. 1811 by Stephen Jones. It was published in its completed form in London, four volumes, 1812. As I have had before me only this last edition, it is somewhat difficult to assign an exact date to the statement regarding Still. But of the three editions I think that of 1782 is the one in which Still was first mentioned as the author of the play. There are two reasons for this opinion:

1. If Still had been mentioned as the author in the edition of 1764, it seems certain that Hawkins ('Origin of the English Drama,' 1773) or Warton ('History of English Poetry,' 1775), or both, would have noted the fact and not have classed the play as anonymous. This silence on the part of Hawkins and Warton excludes the edition of 1764.

2. Still is mentioned as the author by Malone in his 'History of the English Stage' (in his edition of Shakespeare's works, 1790), and Malone evidently got this fact from the 'Bio-

¹ This reference is to the edition of 1812.

graphia Dramatica.' His statement, therefore, excludes the edition of 1812.

The statement of the 'Biographica Dramatica' in regard to Still's authorship is as follows:

"His name as a dramatic writer has been hitherto unknown; but there are circumstances to induce a belief that he was the author of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. C. 4to Black letter. 1575.

In the Bursar's books of Christ's College, 9 Eliz. (i. e., 1566), is the following entry: 'Item for the Carpenters setting upp the scaffold at the Plaie xxd.' As at that time there was no other master of arts of Christ's College whose name began with the letter S; and as it is not probable that any other person than one belonging to the house where the play was acted, would be employed in writing it, there is little reason to hesitate about ascribing this piece to our author."

On this slight piece of evidence have been founded all subsequent attributions of the play to Still. The historians of the drama,* with three exceptions, have adopted Reed's view with a greater or less degree of assent. The three exceptions are Joseph Hunter, George L. Craik, and J. J. Jusserand. Let us notice Craik first (though his criticism is later than Hunter's), as he very successfully refutes Reed's argument. In his 'Sketches of the History of Literature and Learning in England from the Norman Conquest,'³ Craik thus speaks of the authorship:

"The evidence that Bishop Still was the author of *Gammer Gurton's Needle* is exceedingly slight. The play is merely stated on the title-page to have been 'made by Mr. S., Master of Arts;' and even if there was, as is asserted, no other Master of Arts of Christ's College whose name began with an S at the time when the title-page was printed, the author of the play is not stated to have been of that college, nor, if he were, is it necessary to assume that he was living in 1575."

The original statement of Reed can be further answered by the fact that both in 1566 and 1575 there was living, besides Still, another Master of Arts of Christ's College whose name began with S. William Sander.

* I do not include here such historians as Scott and Schlegel, who have not touched on the question of authorship.

³ London, 1844-5, 6 vols. Vol. iii, p. 24 f.

son took his M. A. degree there in 1555, and lived until about the year 1589. Besides Still and Sanderson there were twelve M.A.'s whose names began with S of the different colleges of Cambridge who took their degrees in or before 1566 and were living in 1575.

I next come to the criticism of Joseph Hunter, the eminent antiquary, well-known through his 'New Illustrations of Shakespeare.' This criticism is contained in his 'Chorus Vatum Anglicanarum, collections concerning the Poets and Verse-Writers of the English Nation,' the date of which is 1838, though additions have been made at later periods. This work was acquired by the British Museum in 1863 (where it is MS. Addit. 24487), and has never been published. Through the courtesy of Dr. Richard Garnett, Keeper of Printed Books in the Museum, I was recently enabled to secure a copy of Hunter's paper on the authorship of the play. The paper has as the title,

"John Still John Bridges
Bishop of Bath and Wells. Bishop of Salisbury."⁴

It is inaccurate, discursive, and hardly does more than suggest that Still was not the author; yet it is interesting as being the first attempt to disprove the current attribution of the play to him. After quoting Reed's argument, Hunter says:

"That it was performed at Christ College is amply proved, but that the author was of that college is a non sequitur, since all that is asserted is that he was M. A., it may be presumed of Cambridge."

Hunter sums up by saying: "On the whole I think it improbable that he (Still) was the author."

The third critic to dissent from the current attribution of the play to Still was Jusserand in his 'Le Théâtre en Angleterre.' In a note to his criticism of the play, he says:

"Elle a été généralement attribuée à John Still, évêque de Bath et de Wells, né vers 1543, mort en 1593 (*sic*). Cette hypothèse me semble inadmissible. D'abord la pièce fut probablement imprimée sous le titre de *Diccon of Bedlam* en 1563, époque à laquelle Still n'avait que vingt ans; elle fut sûrement jouée en 1566:

⁴ This is a mistake: Bridges was Dean of Salisbury and Bishop of Oxford.

⁵ Paris, 1881. Pp. 180 and 181, note.

Still n'avait alors que 23 ans. De plus, s'il avait fait jouer cette pièce devant la reine, en 1566, aurait-il pu, en 1592, devenu vice-chancelier de Cambridge, demander à Elizabeth de ne point faire jouer les étudiants devant elle en anglais, mais en latin?

"Il me semble surtout que cette comédie n'a pas, en ce qui concerne la religion, le ton des pièces postérieures à la Réforme. Gammer Gurton brûle un cierge à Sainte-Anne, sans qu'il y ait intention railleuse du poète; le curé est catholique; dans le prologue, on dit que dame Chat ne comprend pas plus les menées de Diccon que Tom, le clerc, ce que le prêtre dit à la messe.

"Le ton est absolument celui qu'on avait au temps de Henri VIII; la satire (rôle du Dr Rat, le curé) est la même que chez Heywood, le '*bigoted catholic*.' Still, d'ailleurs, était protestant, se maria deux fois et eut plusieurs enfants. Sa pièce a été composée, sans doute, au temps où la Réforme n'avait pas encore prévalu; peut-être fut-elle retouchée légèrement avant d'être jouée en 1566; mais on y laissa les allusions à la religion catholique, comme on avait fait pour les Mystères de Chester."

These last remarks of Jusserand call attention to the date of the play, about which there has been much dispute. The older critics advocated the date of 1551 or thereabouts, while recent critics have adopted the later date of 1562 or 1563. It will be easily seen that this question of date has an important bearing on the question of Still's authorship; for if it can be proved, either from external or internal evidence, that the play was written in 1551 or even before, then at once the hypothesis that Still was the author falls to the ground. For, in 1551, he was only eight years old. From the present state of our knowledge as to the date of the play, we have not enough external evidence on which to base a positive statement; from Jusserand's arguments, it is seen that the internal evidence points rather to the earlier date. Still I may say, that after having examined carefully all the evidence accessible on both sides, it seems to me that the more probable date is the later one—about 1562.

It may be well here to notice the list of writers, some of them of eminent authority, who have since 1782 joined in attributing the play to Still. In this list are to be found Malone (1790) and nearly all the nineteenth century critics of the drama and biographers

of Still: Gilliland ('Dramatic Mirror,' 1808), Chalmers ('Biographical Dictionary,' 1816), Nathan Drake ('Shakespeare and his Times,' 1817), Hazlitt ('Lit. of Age of Elizabeth,' 1821), Maginn ('Noctes Ambrosianae,' No. iv, *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1822), Granger ('Biographical History of England,' 1824), Dibdin ('Library Companion,' 1824), Cassan ('Lives of Bishops of Bath and Wells,' 1829-30), White ('Old English Drama,' 1830), Collier ('Annals of the Stage,' 1831), Hallam ('Literature of Europe,' 1837-9), D'Israeli ('Amenities of Literature,' 1840), Chambers ('Cyclopaedia of English Literature,' 1843), Halliwell ('Dictionary of Old English Plays,' 1860), Cooper ('Athenae Cantabrigienses,' 1861), W. C. Hazlitt ('Bibliography of Old English Literature,' 1867), Allibone ('Dictionary of English Literature,' 1870), Ward ('English Dramatic Literature,' 1875), Klein ('Geschichte des englischen Dramas,' 1876), Symonds ('Shakspeare's Predecessors,' 1884), Saintsbury ('Elizabethan Literature,' 1887), and Fleay ('Chronicle History of the London Stage,' 1890). These criticisms range in positiveness from the statement of White, "There seems no doubt that it was the work of Mr. John Still," to that of Ward, "The authorship of the play is attributed (on not quite conclusive evidence) to John Still."⁶

It now remains to bring forward other arguments to show that Still was not the author of the play. All these arguments must depend on external evidence; for, in Still's case, we have nothing whatever in the way of poems or verses, on which to base a comparison with the play. We have, therefore, to rely on contemporary testimony (entirely negative in this case) and on that of writers who lived during the century and a half that followed Still's death.

I. CONTEMPORARY TESTIMONY.

a. Attention has been called to the following piece of evidence both by Collier and Jusserand, but in both cases it was not used in exactly the same way that I shall employ here. Collier thus speaks of the circumstance:

⁶ To this list must be added Morley ('English Writers,' viii, 1892) and Fleay ('Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama,' 1891), whose works came to hand after the above was written. Fleay states in his work (ii, 254) that "the authorship has been all but unanimously ascribed to Still."

"In December, 1592, Dr. John Still . . . was at the head of the University of Cambridge; and a command was received from London, that a comedy in English should be got up there for the amusement of the Queen, as in consequence of the prevalence of the plague, her own actors could not play before her at Christmas."⁷

This command caused the authorities to write to Lord Burghley asking for further time for preparation and for liberty to substitute a Latin for an English comedy. This letter was signed by John Still as Vice-Chancellor, and the portion that bears on the question before us is as follows:

"Englishe Comedies, for that wee never used any, wee presentlie have none: to make or translate one in such shortnes of time wee shall not be able."

It seems strange that Still, if he had written "Gammer Gurton's Needle," would say of a University where that play was performed, that it had never used any English comedy.

b. Sir John Harington (1561-1612), the pupil, the intimate friend, and the parishioner of Still, gives, in his 'Briefe View of the State of the Church of England' (1608),⁸ a succinct account of Still's character. Here Harington relates some incidents in Still's life, but says nothing of Still's connection with the drama. The sketch is not really biographical, but rather pleasant, chatty, personal, and full of anecdotes; in fact, it is the very place where we should expect to find some mention of Still as a dramatist, if he were such. It is noticeable that Harington, in speaking of Bridges, makes mention of his writings in prose and verse; if Still had written anything of note, why did not Harington mention it? The silence of Harington on this point is certainly significant.

c. All the qualities and characteristics of Still of which we know, are against connecting him with such a comedy as "Gammer Gurton's Needle" with its low humor and extreme broadness of expression. It is against all the known facts of his life that he should have written such a play. Of course, it is not held that these facts alone would prevent our con-

⁷ 'Annals of the Stage,' ii, 293.

⁸ In 'Nugae Antiquae,' London, 1804, 2 vols. Vol. ii, p. 157 f.

necting the play with Still, but, as our evidence is largely cumulative, they must be given their due importance. The main facts of Still's life are given in several accessible authorities,⁹ and there is no need of repeating these facts here. It may be noted, however, in passing that there seemed to be no opposition to his accession to the many high offices he held on the score of any scandal or previous misdemeanor connected with his name. It is stated by Harington that Still came to his bishopric "without any touch or scandall."

Several contemporaries of Still testify to his high character. Archbishop Parker said that Still was "a man of much staidness and gravity," and in 1573, when Still was only thirty, spoke thus of him: "I took him, tho' so young, to be more mortified than others of forty or fifty." Harington thus speaks of him:

"Who hath given me some helpes, more hopes, all encouragements in my best studies; to whom I never came, but I grew more religious; from whom I never went, but I parted better instructed. . . . His breeding was from his childhood in good literature and partly in musique. . . . I hold him a rare man for preaching, for arguing, for learning, for lyving; I could only wish, that in all these he would make lesse use of logique, and more of rhetoric."

In a letter of Gabriel Harvey to Spenser occurs this tribute to Still:

"Tho' truly I suppose he had need be an excellent philosopher, a reasonable good Historian, a learned Divine, a wise man, such a one as Dr. Still or Dr. Bing that should show himself in this argument."¹⁰

Hunter queries about this:

"Would not Harvey have alluded to his poetic power, if Still had been known as a writer of verse?"

As Harvey and Still were personal friends, this is certainly a pertinent question.

There is danger in laying too great stress on arguments drawn from the facts of Still's life or from contemporary testimony as to his high character. We must be careful not to look at the question from our nineteenth century point of view, but we should rather remember that in Still's day the notions of people were looser than at present. Life ran higher, licence to a

great degree was permitted, and coarseness was a characteristic of nearly all works. It was also not an uncommon thing for churchmen to write plays. The point, therefore, that I wish to make with regard to Still is not that it was out of keeping with the age for a churchman to write a play, but rather that there is nothing in his life and character to suggest a connection with the drama. It might be added that we have no evidence that Still had taken orders in 1562, the probable date of the play.

2. TRADITIONARY EVIDENCE.

Does any tradition come down to us through the writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that would in any way connect Still with "Gammer Gurton's Needle"? As was said by Reed (1782), "His name as a dramatic writer has been hitherto unknown;" but is it not possible that some work or works, dealing with Still or the drama, may contain a hint as to Still's authorship of the play? It seems highly probable that Reed did not examine all the authorities, and hence he may have missed some allusion to Still's authorship. An examination of the authorities accessible, however, shows an absolute silence on the question.

Fuller ('Worthies,' 1662, and 'History of Cambridge,' 1655), Wood ('Athenae Oxonienses,' 1691-2), Strype (in his numerous historical and biographical works), Langbain (1652-92—'Account of the English Dramatic Poets;' no date), Wright ('Historia Histrionica,' 1699), Newcourt ('Repertorium Ecclesiasticum,' 1708-10), Jacob ('Poetical Register,' 1724), Hearne ('Duo Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Veteres,' 1732), Peck ('Desiderata Curiosa,' 1732-5), Baker ('History of St. John's College,' about 1740), Chetwood ('General History of the Stage,' 1749), Hawkins (1773), and Warton (1775);—all these writers treat more or less fully of Still or "Gammer Gurton's Needle," but in no case are the two connected with each other. Too much dependence must not be put on the silence of these old writers; but some of them were very laborious and painstaking antiquarians.

I have now reached the end of the arguments advanced against Still's authorship, and I therefore sum up: The only evidence we have that the play was by Still is the attribution

⁹ For instance, Cooper's 'Athenae Cantab.,' ii, 467 f.

¹⁰ 'Spenser's Works,' 1750, vi, 307.

of it to him by the 'Biographia Dramatica' two hundred and twenty years after the play was written; this attribution was based on a mere supposition, which has long been disproved by Craik and Hunter, and moreover contains a statement that an examination of the records of the University of Cambridge shows to be false. All succeeding critics have attributed the play to Still, partly on the authority of the 'Biographia Dramatica,' partly because a tradition emanating from that work was afloat. All the evidence that we have in regard to Still or the play is strongly against his authorship. As far as I have been able to discover, there is no contemporary evidence that in the least favors or hints at his authorship of the play: Still's own words as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge are a piece of indirect evidence against it; Sir John Harington's negative testimony is against it; contemporary testimony from churchmen and writers are against it; finally, there is not a particle of traditionary evidence, so to say, that speaks for it. In other words, those very authorities who we should suppose would give us some positive information as to Still's authorship, give very strong negative testimony to the contrary. I hence conclude from the evidence before me that John Still did not write "Gammer Gurton's Needle," and that the burden of proof rests on those who maintain that he did.

This leaves the play for the moment without any known author, and we are now confronted with the question: Is there any evidence that can connect the play with any other writer of the second half of the sixteenth century? This may be answered in the affirmative; for there is strong testimony that the play was the work of John Bridges, afterwards Dean of Salisbury and Bishop of Oxford.

Attention has been called to the authorship of Bridges by three writers. The first of these is Joseph Hunter, whose work, as has been noted, has never been published; the others are Prof. A. W. Ward and Mr. Sidney L. Lee, both of whom do not attribute the play to Bridges. Let us first notice Hunter's statements:

"It (*the play*) was however attributed by a contemporary to quite a different person.

This was Dr. John Bridges, against whom one of the Marprelate tracts is directed."

Here follows the reference to the play in the famous "Epistle" (to be given presently), and Hunter continues:

"This is certainly a testimony not to be despised. If there is anything in the charge, we must suppose the 'Mr. S.' to be a blind or a mistake, or a mistake of the original publisher.

"It has remained I believe hitherto unnoticed. It is supported however by this circumstance that Dr. Bridges did write in verse, another piece being attributed to him, namely a Sheet in rhyme of all the names attributed to the Lord in the Bible. . . . He was of Pembroke Hall the *poetical* college. . .

"On the whole I incline at present to the opinion that Bishop Bridges rather than Bishop Still was the author of this play; or, if we must take a middle way, that both were concerned in it."

Prof. Ward has this to say in a footnote in his 'History of English Dramatic Literature,'¹¹

"From a passage in Martin Marprelate's Epistle (1588) it would appear that Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, the author of the *Defence of Church Government* attacked in that celebrated libel, had been credited with the authorship of this play. But M. M. thinks that the internal evidence of 'somme witte and invention' in the author of the play disproves the supposition."

Mr. Lee, in his sketch of Bridges in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,'¹² says:

"The satirists state doubtfully that he was the author of 'Gammer Gurton's Needle,' usually attributed to Bishop Still."

Are the statements of the satirists doubtful? Let us examine them, and see for ourselves. All of the evidence in favor of the authorship of Bridges is contemporary. The earliest reference to him as the author is to be found in Martin Marprelate's famous "Epistle to the terrible Priests of the Confocation house" (1588).¹³ This pseudonymous pamphleteer is addressing Bridges, and the reference is as follows (p. 10):

"You have bin a worthy writer as they say of a long time; your first book was a proper

¹¹ Vol. i, p. 142, note 4.

¹² Vol. vi, p. 321.

¹³ 'Puritan Discipline Tracts.' Published by John Petterham, London, 1843. Reprinted by Mr. Edward Arber in 'English Scholar's Library,' No. 11. London, 1878.

Enterlude, called Gammar Gurton's needle. But I thinke that this trifle, which sheweth the author to haue had some witte and invention in him, was none of your doing: Because your bookes seeme to proceede from the braynes of a Woodcocke, as having neither wit nor learning."

This very caustic criticism must be taken in its real sense: it is intensely *ironical*, as in fact is the whole "Epistle," which is pitched on a high key of extravagance and vituperation. We must, therefore, not accept too readily the literalness of Martin's statements.

But it is not only in the "Epistle" that the play is attributed to Bridges, but there are equally as strong references in this direction in Martin Marprelate's "Epitome" (1589).¹⁴ This is an epitome of the first book of Bridges's work, 'Defence of Church Government.' On p. 26 Martin says (he is addressing Bridges):

"Do you think that you can answer men, by saying that you indeed wrote page 59. . . . This is a prettie aunswere, is it not thinke you? Let me take you againe in such a pranck, and ile course you, as you were better to be seeking Gammer Gurton's needle, then come within my fingers."

Again on p. 55:

"In deed Master D. (Bridges) quoteth no author for his warraunt, he is redd you know in the Legend of lies. There it is: "There is a what haue the puritans to doe book of this where he found it? Let the answere name, which to it. What if he founde it in M. doctor Hodge his breeches, seeking for made as they Gammer Gurton's needle?" say."

On this latter passage Petheram has the following note:

"P. 55, l. 7. *he is redd you know in the Legend of lies.*] Although the marginal note attributes a book with this title to Bp. Aylmer,¹⁵ Martin probably meant nothing more than that the comedy of 'Gammer Gurton's Needle,' which was written by Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Still, was attributed to him; all dramatic pieces probably being estimated by strict Puritans as Legends of lies."

There is a reference to "Gammer Gurton's Needle" in Thomas Nashe's 'Martin's Month's Mind' (1589),¹⁶ in which tract is given an

¹⁴ 'Puritan Disciplin Tracts.' Published by Petheram, London, 1843. Also reprinted by Mr. Arber, London, 1878.

¹⁵ This is a mistake. Petheram evidently meant Bp. Bridges.

¹⁶ Complete Works of Thomas Nashe. Edited by A. B. Grosart. 'Huth Library,' 1883-84. Vol. i.

account of "the Death and Buriall of Martin Marprelate." Martin is on his death-bed, and calls his sons around him. To these he makes his dying confession (p. 179 f.):

"Three things there are (my sonnes) that were my bane. . . . The first was my *foolerie*. . . . After that some of our companions had dealt sagelie in the cause, and gained good credite with some of some sort; in lept I (like a woodcocke I must confesse) with twatling tales . . . of *Gammer Gurton's Needle, etc., etc., . . . in my Epistle.*"

In the preface "To the Reader," Nashe thus refers to Bridges (p. 164):

"As *who then, I coulde a tolde te tat. Good Neames and Nunkaes. And Kankerburie. With Ka. John O Bridges.*"¹⁷

And just below:

"So that now, the Stage is brought into the Church; and vices make places of Church matters."

Before leaving the testimony of the Marprelate tracts it may be well to notice a statement made by Mr. Saintsbury in regard to them. In his 'Elizabethan Literature' (p. 55), he says:

"*Gammer Gurton's Needle*, attributed to and all but certainly known to be by John Still, afterwards bishop. On the question of authorship, it may be observed that the positive attribution of Martin Marprelate made during Still's life, and, bishop as he was, rather as a compliment than otherwise, seems (inasmuch as it provoked no contradiction from the vigilant scrutineers of any hole in Martin's coat) decisive."

Not all of the Marprelate tracts have been accessible to me; but the evidence of those I have read, is entirely on the side of the authorship of Bridges. Still's name is not once mentioned, and he does not seem to have had any connection whatever with the Marprelate controversy. Mr. Saintsbury's remark is, therefore, very likely, a mistake.

Attention has been called to the fact that Bridges was not only a theologian but also a poet. Besides the work mentioned above by Hunter, Bridges published in 1604 a work entitled 'Novum Testamentum in Hexametros versus . . . translutum,' thus showing that he possessed facility in versification. We have a

¹⁷ These expressions are very obscure: *Neames* and *Nunkaes* are synonyms for "uncles"; "*Kankerburie*" is evidently Canterbury; what the others mean I do not know.

piece of contemporary testimony to the fame of Bridges as a writer and a poet: Sir John Harington, in the work that is quoted above, thus speaks of Bridges (ii. 201):

"The good father, . . . Doctor John Bridges, a man whose vollumes in prose and verse give sufficient testimonie of his industrie; though, for mine own part, I am grown an unfit praiser of poetrie, having taken such a surfeet of it in my youth, that I think now, a gray head and a vearse do not agree together, and much lesse a grave matter and a vearse. . . . I am almost of opinion, that one ought to abjure all Poetrie when he comes to Divinitie."

Not much is known concerning the life of Bridges, but he has become famous as that churchman who started the celebrated Marprelate controversy. All that is really known of the facts in his life is summed up by Mr. Lee in the 'Dictionary of National Biography.' I call attention to a few of these that have a bearing on our question.

The date of Bridges's birth is unknown, though it is stated that he died at a great age in 1618. He took his M.A. at Cambridge in 1560, and this date is in accord with the dates of the composition and production of "Gammer Gurton's Needle." The fact also that he spent some years in Italy in his youth would tend to show that he early came under direct poetical influence. During his lifetime, he made translations from the Latin and the Italian, and in 1587 he published his greatest work, "A Defence of the Government established in the Church of Englande," a ponderous quarto of 1412 pages. These various works show the versatility of his powers, and, despite the caustic irony of Martin, he must have been a man of some ability and no little strength of character. In a stormy and eventful period in church affairs, he seems to have been a striking figure, and more than once was he called on to defend his church.

Having gone through all the evidence in favor of the authorship of Bridges, it may be well to sum up: The biographer of Bridges, Lee, and the historian of the English drama, Ward, refuse to attribute the play to Bridges, but accept the current attribution of it to Still; but as early as 1838 Hunter suggested that Bridges might be the author. All of the contemporary evidence is in favor of Bridges: it is striking how often his name and that of the

play are connected together in the various Marprelate tracts. It may be objected to this evidence, that the satirist is heaping ridicule on Bridges, and would resort to such a shift—namely, that of attributing such a low and vulgar performance to a churchman high in power—to help his cause. But another prominent churchman, Bishop Bale, wrote a play, "Kynge Johan," that is quite as vulgar as "Gammer Gurton's Needle;" besides, the latter play is not connected with any other churchman, though Martin satirizes a good many. It must have been the opinion current at the time, that Bridges wrote the play.

The difficulty that presents itself is the "Mr. S. Master of Art;" but may not this be taken as a blind or a mistake? Is it not possible that in those days of poor printing and many typographical errors an S might be easily mistaken for a B? Is it right to hang all question of authorship on a single initial, when all the weight of evidence is against the authorship of any one whose name begins with S?

I conclude that, while the evidence is perhaps not strong enough to declare positively that he wrote the play, yet there is a strong probability that John Bridges was the author of "Gammer Gurton's Needle."

CHARLES H. ROSS.

Johns Hopkins University.

NOTES TO 'HERMANN UND DOROTHEA.'

I am indebted to Professor Brandt for his very full notes upon my edition of 'Hermann und Dorothea,' and especially for his careful verification of the references. He has also called my attention to certain points that I had overlooked which were worthy of comment.

There are a few questions which the reviewer raises, or discusses, that are deserving of consideration beyond the subject which has called them out. He doubts very properly whether the form *Nächte* in Cantos viii, 56 and ix, 10, can have survived in the literary language of the eighteenth century from the M. H. G. gen. sing. *nehete*. The question is certainly pertinent, and evidence of such survival should be available in Goethe's other writings, or in the dialect which he occasionally used, or in other literature of the time.

In a hasty examination of "Der junge Goethe" I find no similar instance, though it may exist. I think we may say that the singular meaning is that which best accords with the sense, especially in the second instance, *der Nächte Gefahren*. In the early Latin versions of 'Hermann und Dorothea,' *Nächte* is translated in these cases by the singular.

The noun *Nacht* presents a wide variety of forms owing to the mingling of various declensions in its inflexion. Goethe himself uses *zu Nachts*, *bei Nachte*, and *Nacht* (acc. pl.); Wagner translates *Nächte* by "patches of darkness" in the former case, but I find no parallel uses to justify this, although one or two cases occur of the use of *Nächte* in the plural in a transferred sense, 'spiritual doubts.' All this shows how greatly we need a dictionary of Goethe's writings, based upon the original texts and upon his letters and diaries. Such a work would throw great light upon the chaotic condition of the language at the close of the eighteenth century and be extremely valuable for the light which it would throw upon other works of the period.

The history of the word *Römer*, as applied to a drinking glass, is still obscure in spite of Friedrich's conjecture that it is derived from a material *vitrum Romanum*, employed in enamel. The art of the first enamels manufactured in Germany came from the east. Glasses are more commonly named from their shape or place of manufacture, than from the material from which they are made. The earliest quotations given by Heyne are from the years 1589 and 1609. The term 'Roman glass' appears in Eraclius, of the twelfth century: *er sach dd manic roemisch glas*, line 856, where it relates to jewels, enamels or mosaic. I quoted Skeat as presenting about the only explanation, though I knew no historical basis for it. I suspect that light will be thrown on the history of the word from its use in Netherlandish. Its extensive currency in the Low German dialects and the meaning, often emphasized, of a large glass, explains a supposed connection of the word with *Raum*.

The word appears in Dutch first in Kilian (1574), as *roomer*: Gron. *ruimer* points to an umlaut of *o* (Dutch *oe*): West-Flemish *rommer* also suggests *o*, but the *nebenform rum-*

mer whence Eng. *rummer* is unexpected. The word undoubtedly arose in the Low countries in the sixteenth century with the art of manufacturing Venetian glass, and was then adopted into High German.

The word *Bracke* or *Bräke*, 'whiffle-tree,' is a Low German word. The use of *Bräke*, 'flail,' 'hemp-breaker,' which seems kindred to it, occurs in many Low German dialects, also in the sense of 'brush-wood,' or 'fragment of wood.' I do not find *Bracke* in 'Grimm' in this sense, though it occurs in 'Sanders.'

The word *spring-bar* for *whiffle-tree* occurs. The form *spring-bar-tree*, I must join with Professor Brandt in abandoning, though I see no reason why the word *tree* may not have been added provincially, as in the case of so many other words; as, *low-tree*, *axle-tree*, *saddle-tree*; something like *Baum* in numerous compounds in German. In a note to v, 147, I quote from Uhland, and add the title of the poem. Professor Brandt thinks that here "Graf Eberhard der Ranschbart appears as an author." This is equivalent to saying that whoever quoted from Shelley and cited the source, "To the Skylark," ascribed the authorship of the poem to the skylark.

The note to i, 200, the reviewer regards as "misleading." But the quotation was not made to explain the meaning of *zu*, as he implies, but to illustrate the whole passage in a parallel quotation from Schiller, whose "Lied von der Glocke" was begun about the time Goethe was finishing 'Hermann und Dorothea,' with which Schiller was familiar.

Similarly in the note to vi, 147, the reviewer overlooks the fact that the quotation is not designed to contain the identical meaning of *häuslich*, but to illustrate from the companion poem the praise of domesticity with whatever qualities may be included in it, whether of frugality or carefulness.

It is not clear whether the reviewer's note to viii, 11, is intended as an emendation or elaboration of my brief note to *dräuel*. I nowhere say that *drohen* is found in Luther, though it occurs in translations of the Bible before Luther; as, in the so-called 'Fourth Translation' (1470) in the forms *drowen* and *dröwen*, also in Hans Sachs and in other fifteenth and sixteenth century writings. The

two forms *dräuen* and *drohen* exist side by side to the eighteenth century. It is impossible to be dogmatic in speaking of forms found in Luther. The same word occurs differently in successive editions of Luther's Bible, according to the printer and the place of publication, and even differs in various parts of the same edition. In the 'Wartburger Bibel' of 1534, we find a dozen cases where the form *drewen* appears in the Old Testament and Apocrypha; in the new Testament we find *bedrawen* and *drawen*, and occasionally *drewen*; in Luther's last revision of 1545, we find prevalingly *drewen*; in the 'Kurfürsten-Bibel' of 1708, these forms are uniformly given as *dräuen* and *bedräuen*. In the Codex Teplensis which is almost identical with the first printed German Bible (1466), if not the original of the same, we find *drohen*, *droen*, and once *drowen*.

In Canto iv, 199, it is of course possible to read a sensuous meaning into the verse, but the pure, idyllic character of the poem and the words in the mouth of a mother, make such an interpretation foreign to its entire spirit. No criticism of this nature, so far as I know, appeared at the time, when jealous rivals and partisans sought to detract from the author's genius and the merits of the poem.

There is one criticism apparently general in character which the reviewer makes:

"The sources of a number of quotations are not given at all: or merely the author, or book and chapter, or act and scene are given."

There is occasionally an omission in stating the exact origin of a quotation, where I had accumulated references to special forms, or illustrative passages, but where subsequently, even with much labor, I could not recover the source. Such is the quotation to v, 179, which is from 'Die Gunst des Augenblicks.' Knowing the great difficulty of verifying authorities when reference is made to a special edition, which others often may not possess, I sought to make it possible for anyone, with any edition, to examine the original source, by quoting by book and chapter, act and scene, and also by volume and page of certain standard and accessible editions. Most of the references to which the reviewer objects were made in this way, and I know no better. No

system of quotation can be blinder than the other method used in the first volumes of Grimm and in Sanders.

One or two additional minor points may be mentioned. In Canto iii, 6, the expression *der Alten*, may well mean as the reviewer suggests 'of the forefathers,' or 'of our ancestors,' but it equally accords with the words and with the character of the ambitious, maxim-loving landlord to suppose that he attempted an apparently learned reference to the classics. In Canto vii, 185, the reviewer says, "*noch* does not mean additional." The passage is "*noch viele Grüsse befahl sie.*" I conceive of the scene as follows: Dorothea has given her parting salutation to the judge, l. 170, and to the invalid l. 172; then follows a parenthetical passage 173-185; many friends in the meantime have arrived l. 186; as Hermann draws Dorothea away, she turns and continues to send greetings to friends whom she is leaving. Any change of form of the translation seems to embody the same idea.

The forms *fein* and *redlich* in different versions of the narrative of the Salzburg Emigrants, were used in the same sense in the last century for 'honorable,' 'respectable,' 'excellent,' but it is to be regretted that 'honest' has no longer the meaning of 'honorable.'—That Gerhard's favorite hymn "Ich bin ein Gast auf Erden" does not illustrate the text from which it is derived (Ps. cxix, 19) and the source of the passage "Nur ein Fremdling ist der Mensch auf Erden," ix, 269, is an extraordinary judgment.—Any further examination of minor statements in the review is not necessary.

There are a few points upon which the reviewer did not touch which are worthy of mention. The translation of *Tafeln*, iii, 83, has produced a difference of opinion, some regarding it as 'frames,' others as meaning 'panes.' I find in Goethe's 'Tagebuch,' 2. Bd., August 28, 1797: "Es (die Fenster-scheiben) sind länglich viereckte Tafeln."

Whewell's translation of 'Hermann und Dorothea' has been twice reprinted in this country, without acknowledgment, even in one case with an attempt at appropriation, as in the *Democratic Review* for 1848. The volume edited by S. E. Brownell, New York, 1849,

contains also Whewell's translation, with few modifications, so far as I have been able to examine it. Can any one tell me whether the translation by the Englishman Mellish, was ever published? It was complete, May 2, 1798, and he was to read aloud the first four Cantos to Goethe upon that day. See the 'Schiller-Goethe Briefwechsel,' No. 455. Mellish was intimate with the Weimar circle. He held, if I mistake not, the position of Consul General of Great Britain in Hamburg for many years. His translation of 'Maria Stuart' from Schiller's manuscript affords valuable material in determining the original form of this drama. I find that Mellish published about 1820 a volume of translations into English from the Latin and German, but I can learn nothing further about its contents.

As to the capacity of the English language to produce satisfactory hexameters, I have no question. Of course by English hexameters we mean following the laws of modern verse, and not attempting to reproduce the quantity of classical verse.

W. T. HEWETT.

Cornell University.

CONCERNING ENGLISH MYSTERY PLAYS.

In the 'Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur' by Bernhard ten Brink, vol. ii, p. 290, we read:

"Dem geistlichen Drama von Chester wird das von Dublin Manches zu verdanken gehabt haben. In der Hauptstadt Irlands gab es wenigstens seit dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert—Frohnleichnamsspiele, über deren Beschaffenheit wir leider sehr unvollkommen unterrichtet sind. Von dreizehn bis vierzehn Pageants kennen wir mehr oder weniger genau den Inhalt, ausserdem die Namen der Zünfte, welche sie aufführten. Erhalten ist uns darunter nur das Spiel der Weber: "Abraham und Israhel," dessen metrische Form uns sofort an den Chester-Cyclus gemahnt."

Through an investigation which, of late, I have been making concerning the English mystery plays, I have been led to question the above statement. The evidence upon which a cycle of plays has been credited to Dublin is stated in Whitelaw and Walsh's 'History of Dublin,' vol. i, p. 110, under "Pageants for Corpus Christi," in these words:

1. "Glovers. Adam and Eve with angel bearing sword before them.
2. Corrisees (perhaps curriers). Cain and Abel with offering and altar.
3. Mariners and vintners. Noah and the persons in the ark appareled as carpenters and salmon-takers.
4. Weavers. Abraham and Isaac with offering and altar.
5. Smiths. Pharaoh and his host.
6. Skinners. Camel with the children of Israel.
7. Goldsmiths. King of Cullen.
8. Hoopers. Shepherds with an angel singing Gloria in excelsis Deo.
9. Corpus Christi gild. Christ in his passion with the Marys and angels.
10. Taylors. Pilate with his fellowship, and his wife clothed accordingly.
11. Barbers. Anna and Caiaphas.
12. Fishers. The Apostles.
13. Merchants. The Prophets.
14. Butchers. The Tormentors."

These pageants are evidently carefully named in the order in which they pass in the procession. A little study will show that it is impossible to construct a cycle out of these pageants taken in this order, or in any order. The Goldsmiths should follow the Hoopers; 10 and 11 have no significance as following 9; 12 is, perhaps, possible, but what of 13 and 14?

Again, the description of the pageants would apply much more aptly to fixed tableaux than to plays. In only one is any action implied, and that is the singing of an angel. Still, the objection may be offered that the descriptions of several of the plays in the York cycle would also apply more aptly to tableaux, but that we have the plays. This must be admitted, and in my opinion either there were with some of the York pageants representations accompanying the pageant wagon, such as paintings on flags, or, as seems more probable, the actors themselves posed in tableaux, as the pageant passed from station to station. I cannot otherwise explain such descriptions as, in York v, "Adam et Eva et arbor inter eos"; in xi, "Moyses exaltans serpentem in deserto, Pharaoh Rex, viii Judei admirantes et expectantes," and many others. Such evidences only illustrate the fact to which we have elsewhere, in royal entries and in processions, abundant testimony, that to the mediæval mind pageantry, fixed or movable tableaux, was as important and interesting a show as the spoken play.

But the Dublin processional pageants do not stand alone. They are illustrated by the pageants in the Aberdeen Candlemas procession in the "Offerand of Our Lady," miscalled a play by Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith in 'York Mystery Plays,' p. lxxv. For this procession the 'Records of Aberdeen, Spaulding Club,' p. 451, under the date of May 22d, 1531, gives the following:

"The flescharis, Sanct Bestian and his Tormentouris.
The barbouris, Sanct Lowrance and his Tormentouris.
The skinnaris, Sanct Martyne and his Tormentouris.
The taylyeouris, the Coronatioun of Our Lady.
Litstaris, Sanct Nicholes.
Wobstaris, walcaris, and bonet makaris,
Sanct John.
Baxtaris, Sanct Georg.
Wrichtis, messonis, sclateris, and cuparis,
The Resurreccioun.
The smithis and hammirmen to furneiss
The Bearmen of the Croce."

The records of Aberdeen shed more light upon tableaux of this character than do those of Dublin. We can trace them from 1442 to 1531, nearly a century, and observe their changes. The earlier series show more signs of an originally cyclic construction, but at no stage are they as near the primitive type as are those of Dublin, however much they may aid us to an understanding of the latter.

The tableau mystery is the *mystère mimé* of the French, and can be best studied on French soil. The Bethune pageants of 1549, as given by Petit de Julleville in 'Les Mystères,' vol. ii, p. 212-13, although greatly outnumbering those of any procession in England, retain fully the cyclic form, beginning with the Annunciation and closing with the Judgment. The earliest one recorded was exhibited at Paris before Edward ii, in 1313; and of a mute mystery of stationary pageants, in 1420, representing in connected story the Passion, it is said by the same author that it was "a bas-relief of living figures counterfeiting a bas-relief of stone."

From these instances it can readily be seen that these connected pageants at first presented to the eye a mystery play in tableaux, but later legendary and allegorical subjects intruded, breaking the sequence and destroying the cycle. The Dublin pageants have departed but a step from the cyclic form, the Aberdeen

have gone much further. Nevertheless, this step the Dublin pageants have taken, and they could not have done so had they been spoken plays.

Another proof of the tableau character of these pageants lies in the fact that they were apparently soon abandoned by the gilds of Dublin. We do not find that cycle plays were ever easily discarded. They were costly. Entries of expenditure upon them are frequent in the gild account books, and the city records abound in regulations concerning their presentation, and in acts for the relief of weak gilds. A tableau pageant might be more easily displaced by another, or discarded, as was often the case in royal entries and elsewhere. The evidence that the Dublin gilds soon dropped the pageants from their procession is found in this statement by the authority already quoted. I give the substance of it, not the exact words. In 1541 the procession of Corpus Christi at Dublin was similar to other processions, without pageants, but was followed by the play of the Nine Worthies.

But if the Corpus Christi pageants were tableaux, what about the Dublin play of Abraham and Isaac, which is extant? The records again offer us an explanation. In 1528, according to the above-named authority, certain crafts in Dublin acted plays during Christmas week before certain high officials. Each day one craft presented a play which was chosen for some supposed reference to the occupation of the craft; thus the tailors played Adam and Eve; the shoemakers, Crispin and Crispianus; the vintners, Bacchus and his story; the carpenters, Joseph and Mary; the smiths, Vulcan and what related to him; the bakers, a comedy of Ceres, the goddess of corn. The Priors of St. John of Jerusalem, of the Blessed Trinity, and of All-Hallows put upon the stage, the one the Passion of our Savior, the others the several deaths which the Apostles suffered. If, now, the play of the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem, or that of the carpenters, were extant, wherein would it differ from the play of Abraham and Isaac? Would not the presumption in favor of a cycle be as strong as with the play in question?

In view of the fact that the mystery play was the form that most occasional plays took

at that time, and that the customary entertainment at any festivity was such a play, I think we are forced to accept this "Abraham and Isaac" as one of the multitude of occasional plays that were fashioned so easily on the model of existing plays.

Upon the same page ten Brink also makes this statement:

"Gehen wir von Chester südwards durch die wallisische Mark, so treffen wir, dem Lauf des Severn folgend, auf die Städte Shrewsbury, Worcester, Tewkesbury, deren Namen alle drei, wenn auch nicht an hervorragender Stelle, in den Annalen des englischen Dramas verzeichnet sind."

This statement occurs in the midst of a discussion of mystery plays, and is misleading so far as concerns Shrewsbury. The only evidence that I have found for plays at Shrewsbury is contained in Fosbroke's 'Encyclopædia of Antiquities,' ed. 1843, vol. ii, p. 665. This states that in 1574 at Shrewsbury a stage-play was acted in the High Street by the players of the Earl of Essex. How do we know that this was a mystery play? These companies of players did not at that date customarily act mystery plays. Further, if the plays acted by companies under the patronage of some noble are to be considered, why stop with Shrewsbury? Whenever the plague, or any other cause, interrupted their entertainments in London, these companies sought the provinces and played wherever they could make a shilling. These plays were legion, but are not, as I understand the term, to be classed under mystery plays.

CHARLES DAVIDSON.

Belmont School, California.

ETYMOLOGIES.

I. OLD FRENCH *Plevir*.

THE difficulties surrounding the etymology of *plevir* and its Romance and English cognates have often been discussed and several impossible derivations have been suggested: cf. Diez, 'Wb.'; Littré, 'Dict.'; and other literature in Mackel: "Die Germanischen Elemente in der französischen und provenzalischen Sprache."

The last-named writer is apparently on the right track when he recognizes the reflex of a

Germanic *pley* in the *v* of the Romance words; but failing to see the exact nature and inter-relation of the Germanic forms, he is unable to account for the *u* as well as for the *i* of *plevir*. It is not *plaihvan* nor *plāwun*, *plewan* that we need, but *pleujan*. Now, this is in keeping with the formative principles and phonetic laws of Germanic and it alone suffices to account for *plevir*.

Indo-European root *blegh*—thus Sütterlin, *Bezenberger's Beiträge* xvii, p. 163, but *bleq* with simple *tenuis* is, perhaps, more probable—Greek *βλέπω*, Latin *SU-BULCUS*, *BU-BULCUS*, gives Germanic *plehw*, which, according to Verner's law, alternates with *plegw*, and the latter according to Sievers' law becomes *pley*. Germanic *plegan* owes its *g* to secondary influence of weak forms ending in *u*.—Idg. *bleq*: Germanic *plegan-pleujan* from *ple(g)wjan* is exactly like Idg. *og*: Germanic *augōn*—Anglo-Saxon *fwan* from *au(g)wjan*.

II. JACOBUS—JAIMES, JAMES, GIACOMO, ETC.

In *Jaimes* and its Romance cognates and English derivatives, we find an *m* instead of the etymological *b* of *Jacobus*. The only similar interchange that is known to me, occurs in *samedi* < *SABBATI DIEM*. However, in *samedi* we recognize not only in the *m*, but also in the vocalism the influence of *SEPTIMUM DIEM*, *se (p)me di*, 'seventh day.' Moreover, as Kluge shows in his beautiful work on the pre-historic condition of the Germanic languages in Paul's 'Grundriss' i, 319, there existed a Greek *Arrian βαμβαρὸς* which has left its traces in many languages, and which may also in the North of Gaul have helped to develop a nasalized *samedi*. Thus *Jaimes* remains alone; and here, too, the *m* must be due to some outside influence. The latter will easily be recognized in the numerous Graeco-Latin and Romance names ending in *-mus*, *-mes*: *Chrysostomus*, *Didymus*, *Zosymus*, *Hieronimus*, *Onesymus*, *Oekonomus*; in addition to these there were adjectives ending in *-mus* which were largely used as proper names: *Optumus*, *Maxumus*; perhaps even *dominus* (often preceding our word as a title), may have influenced its form. It is, then, to a psychological motive, 'Suffixvertauschung,' not to a physiological sound-change, that the *m* of *Jaimes*, etc., is due.

III. GERMANIC *slehta*.

Gothic *slaihts*, O.N. *sléttr* from **slehtaR*, O.H.G. *slēht*—the English *slight* is probably a Netherlandish borrowing, cf. Kluge, 'Wb.'—are -*to* derivatives from *γ* Germanic *slīk*, I.-E. *slīg*; the original meaning is 'smoothed, even, straight,' thence 'plain, vulgar,' etc. We have here one more case of a root in *ī* having developed forms with *ē*, as a result of 'breaking.' While the conditions of this breaking are not yet known in all cases, the law is well established before *r* and *h*; cf. now on the subject of breaking, Kluge in Paul's 'Grundriss' i, 355.

IV. ENGLISH *dear*, GERMAN *teuer*.

Old-English *dýrre*, O.N. *dýrr*, O.H.G. *tiuri* + *tūr* reflect a Germanic *deurja* < *deura*, *dūra*. This cannot be anything else but I.-E. *dheuro-dhūro*. In the latter I recognize a -*ro* derivative from the root *dhū*. The formal correspondence is perfectly correct, nor does the meaning offer any difficulty. Root *dhū* means originally 'motion, emotion, excitement'; and we can understand the limitation of such neutral meaning in *bonam partem* as well as we recognize the opposite in Lat. *furor*, partly in Greek *θυμός*, 'anger.' *Dhūro* 'excitement, astonishment, admiration,' cf. *θαύμα*, *θαυμάζω*, thence *dheurjo* 'admirable,' yields very naturally the basis for the Germanic meanings: 'valuable, beloved' and by an interesting shifting which has taken place in historical times on German soil, *bedauern* = 'regret.' The development of a neutral term, a 'vox media' either in *bonam* or *malam partem* has numerous analoga; cf. *fortuna*, *luck*, *chance*; German *schön*, *gefallen* and many others. First specified by a determinative expression accompanying them, they gradually were limited to the same specified meaning, then the specifying term seemed useless and was omitted. More examples illustrating the same process will be found in the next number of Sievers' (*Paul und Braune*) *Beiträge* under "*Senne*."

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

BRANT UND ERASMUS.

BEZUGNEHMEND auf meinen Aufsatz in der Februar- und Märznummer der MOD. LANG.

NOTES über Brant und Erasmus sei es mir gestattet, zwei Proben aus Brant's profanen Narrentypen anzuführen, die erweisen mögen, in welcher Weise Erasmus die Anregung mancher Gedanken aus seiner Quelle schöpfte, aber in der Ausführung derselben völlig original blieb. Erasmus ist auch hierin 'ein Mann für sich.'

BRANT, NS. Cap. lxxiv.

ERASMUS, 'Encomium.'

Mancher vil kost uf jagen leit,
das im doch wenig nutz usz-
dreit,
wie wol er dick ein weid-
spruch seit.

Von unnutzem jagen.

Jagen ist ouch on *narrheit*
nit,
vil zit vertribt man on nutz
mit;
wil woles sin sol ein kurz-
wil,
so darf es dannah kostens
vil;
darzū darf man vil herter zit,
wie man im nochlouf, gang
und rit,
und sūcht all berg, tal, wāld
und heck,
do man verhag, wart und
versteck;
die buren jagen in dem schne;
der adel hat kein vorteil me,
wan er dem wiltpret lang
nochlouft,
so hats der bur heimlich ver-
kouft.
Nembroht zūm erst fing ja-
gen an,
dan er von got was ganz ver-
lan;
Esau der jagt, um das er was
ein sūnder und der gots ver-
gasz.
wenig jūger als Humpertus
findt man ietz und Eustachi-
us. . . .

Ad hunc ordinem (i. e. *stultorum*) pertinent et isti, qui prae venatu ferarum omnia contemnunt, atque incredibilem amini voluptatem percipere se praedicant, quoties foedum illum cornuum cantum audierint, quoties canum eiulatus. . . . Deinde quae suavis, quoties fera lanienda est! Tauros et vervecos humili plebi laniare licet, feram nisi a generoso secari nefas. . . . Porro cui contigerit, e bellua nonnihil gustare, is vero existimat, sibi non parum nobilitatis accedere. Itaque quum isti assidua ferarum insectatione atque esu nihil aliud assequantur, nisi ut ipsi prope modum in feras degenerent, tamen interea regiam vitam agere se putant.

Der Unterschied zwischen Erasmus und Brant ist der, dass ersterer auf den demoralisierenden, verrohenden Einfluss der Hetzjagden hinweist, dem sich gerade der Adel hingiebt, letzterer hingegen an dem Jagen an sich moralisch nichts Tadelnswertes findet. Nur hält er es für eine Torheit, "vil zit on nutz mit zu vertriben," grosse Kosten auf die "kurzwil" zu verwenden, sich der Mühseligkeit des

Jagens zu unterziehen, zumal der Bauer, gegen den Brant überhaupt ein Häkchen hat,* dem Adel oft genug den Vorteil wegschnappt. Freilich die grossen biblischen Jäger, Nimrod und Esau, wurden von Gott verlassen, weil auch sie, von der Jägerei in Anspruch genommen, seiner vergassen. Hubertus und Eustachius-Placidus führten trotz ihres Jägerhandwerks ein heiliges Leben.

Seinen Jägernarren lässt Erasmus die Bauern unmittelbar folgen, die ins Wesen hinein Bauten aufführen, welche weit über die ihnen zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel gehen. Es kann keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass die Quelle für den Gedanken in Brant's NS., Cap. xv, zu suchen ist.

BRANT, NS. Cap. xv.

Wer buwen wil, der schlag
vor an,
was kostens er darzu müsz
han,
er würt sunst vor dem end
abstan.

Von narrechttem anslag.

Der ist ein narr, der buwen
wil
und nit vorhin anschlecht
wie vil
das kosten werd, und ob er
mag
vollbringen solchs, noch sim
ansschlag.
vil hant grosz buw geschla-
gen an
und müchtent nit darbi be-
stan.

(Beispiele: Nabuchodonosor, Nimrod.)

wer buwen wil, das in nit
ruw;
der bdenk sich wol, e dann
er buw;
dann manchem kumt sin ruw
zu spat,
so im der schad in seckel
gat.
wer etwas gross wil under-
stan,
der soll sin selbst bewerung
han
ob er mög kumen zu dem stat,
den er im für genomen hat,
domit im nit ein gluck zufall

ERASMUS, 'Encomium.'

Et his (i.e. stultis venatori-
bus) simillimum genus eor-
um, qui insatiabili aedifica-
di studio flagrant, nunc ro-
tunda quadratis, nunc quad-
rata rotundis permutantes.
Neque vero finis ullus, neque
modus, donec ad extremam
redactis inopiam, nec ubi
habitent, nec quid edant
supersit. Quid tum postea?
Interim annos aliquot sum-
ma cum voluptate peregr-
erunt.

und werd zu spot den men-
schen all,
vil weger ist, nilt understan,
dann mit schad, schand, ge-
spöt ablan.

HERMANN SCHÖNFELD.

Johns Hopkins University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Peyton's Glasse OF Time. 12mo, pp. xxxvii,
177. New York: JOHN B. ALDEN, 1891.

THIS quaint and attractive volume was published during the reign of James I. of England, the first part appearing in 1620, the second in 1623. There is a copy of the original edition in the library of the British Museum and in the library of Harvard College. For a long period the book seems to have faded out of memory, being forgotten even by scholars and specialists. More than thirty years ago, the *North American Review* (October, 1860), advocated the publication of a new edition, but not until recent times did the suggestion meet with a cordial response, and result in preserving to the scholar of our day this pleasing memorial of a time almost contemporary with Shakespeare, and fully contemporary with Bacon, Ben Jonson, and the youthful days of Milton. A well-known gentleman of Staunton, Va., who is endowed with keen æsthetic sympathy and genuine literary discernment, is to be credited with the publication of the volume in its present form, he having reproduced the work during a sojourn in England from the original copy in the British Museum. Much of the interest of the book lies in the fact that its theme is identical with that of Milton's 'Paradise Lost,'—the creation, temptation, and fall of man. The riming verse in which it is written would have incurred the disapprobation of Milton in his later days, when his aversion to the beggarly bondage of riming had become thoroughly fixed and established. We can see no sufficient reason for assuming that the 'Glass of Time' was one of the prototypes or models of 'Paradise Lost.' The claims advanced in the same direction for Cædmon and Vondel are not satisfactory or convincing. However ingenious the argument, or however marked the likenesses that may be pointed

*Vide lxxiii, Zeile 4-6: "on arbeit leb und sig ein her"; lxxxii, Z. 47: "der adel hat kein vorteil me." (Bauern-dünkel).

out, in conception or in phraseology, Milton's latter day reprobation of rime, except under special conditions, as well as the circumstance that the theme of his great epic is many centuries older in English literature alone than Peyton's era, is a sufficient refutation. Despite this concession, the charm of the book is rare, and it affords a rich field for the elucidation of English literature during the first quarter of the xvii. century. We purpose to notice its characteristics of style, not that they are exclusively peculiar to the writer, but on account of their illustrative value to the student of our linguistic development during the age of 'wise Bacon' and 'brave Raleigh.' The Dedications to James I., Prince Charles, and the Lord Chancellor Bacon, are in point of merit above the typical style of the time, and of later times as well.

The edition of the book before us contains all that is definitely known in regard to the life and work of Peyton. He was a Royalist in politics, an Anglican in religion, a lawyer by profession. He died in 1626, the death year of Bacon, at the age of thirty one, before he had completed his work in accordance with the original design. Milton was then a lad of eighteen and was seeking inspiration from the Galahads and Percivals of the Arthurian myth, rather than from the story of man's first disobedience.

Let us note some of the characteristic forms and usages that mark the author's language; they appeal to the student from the philological, as well as the literary point of view.

In Part i, Stanza 4, we find the verb *conster* to create or produce consternation.

"And as a foul mishapen pointed monster
Conceit of her as all the world doth *conster*."

The word *cashier* had not in Peyton's time acquired its exclusively technical or specialized sense, as is illustrated in the following examples: it was tending towards it, as may be seen from "Othello" I, i, 48, and from other familiar Shakesperian passages.

Stanza 8, Part i:

"The angel which against the Lord did swell,
He quite *cashiered* and cast him down to hell."

Stanza 73, Part i:

"*Cashier* them both out of that lovely place,
To die a death in miserable case."

Baine as a verb to prove a bane or injury.

Stanza 78, Part i:

"Alas, weake man what can it do thee good
To know the tree that thus has *bained* thy blood?"

Also Stanza 78, Part i:

"Still to this day maintaining errors plaine,
To tell the fruite that thus themselves did *baine*."

Minion has its characteristic Elizabethan and French sense of *favorite*, *darling*. Stanza 14, Part i:

"Now tell me Rome that thinkst thyself the *minion*,
Christ's only Vicar in thine own opinion."

Hoddy Loddy. Stanza 4, Part i:

"But to God's people should remaine no rest
That toyle and travell painfull works always,
And *Hoddy Loddy*, Topsy Turvey play."

Puritant is the characteristic form for Puritan.

Stanza 59, Part i:

"The *Puritant* he is again as nice
As those uncivill in their clamorous vice."

See also stanza 123, Part i; Stanza 160, Part ii.

Azed. Stanza 161, Part i:

"In all the world how well I may compare,
To *azed* Enoch walking in the air."

Venter. Stanza 19, Part ii; also Stanza 24, Part ii:

"Or like a man that *venters* for a prize,
Hood winckt and made starke blind in both eyes."

The form *venter* survives in provincial usage.

Urcked. Stanza 20, Part ii:

"Even so is Adam in that *urcked* place,
The flaming sword still blazing in his face."

Amates. Stanza 20, Part ii:

"The radiant splendor of the Cherubims,
Dazles, *amates*, his tender eyesight dims."

Also Stanza 161, Part ii:

"*Amates* his mind and scared conscience pricks."

Labroious. Stanza 41, Part ii:

"When the dear painful wise *labroious* Bee,
Ten thousand ways about heavens blossoms flee."

Simulize. Stanza 69, Part ii:

"False hypocrite how canst thou *simulize*
Before my face thy actions foul disguise."

Bespaked. Stanza 69, Part ii:

"Why is thy soul thus pestered with a sore,
Rankled, *bespaked*, like a rotten core."

Partialize. Stanza 72, Part ii:

"No outward form can make thee *partialize*,
Thou lookst upon the inward sacrifice."

Gurnes=*grins*, a word familiar to students of Elizabethan literature. Stanza 74, Part ii:

"Whilst those returned like to a dog that *gurns*,
That back againe unto his vomit turns."

For an example of the word in modern literature, see Browning's "Old Pictures in Florence," stanza 9.

"And here where your praise might yield returns,
And a handsome word or two give help,
Here, after your kind, the mastiff *gurns*,
And the puppy pack of poodles yelp."

In Part ii, Stanza 83, we have a proximate parallel to a well-known Tennysonian passage:

"Even then he *takes occasion by her lock*,
Singles forth Habel from his harmless flock."

See Tennyson's "Dedication to the Queen," stanza 8.

"And statesmen at her council met,
Who knew the seasons when to *take*
Occasion by the hand and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet."

In Part ii, Stanza 116, we have an example of the rhematic *to* which is by no means common in Elizabethan English.

"That she shall be the object of his eye,
His darling deare from her to *never flye*."

Foretype used as a verb, see "Dedication to the Lord Chancellor Bacon," stanza 1; also Stanza 170, Part ii:

"The King himself (T'*immortalize* thy fame)
Hath in thy name *foretyped* out the same."

The student of Tennyson will recall the use of *type* as a verb in "In Memoriam," section 118, stanza 4:

"Who thrave and branched from clime to clime,
The herald of a higher race,
And of himself in higher place,
If so he *type* this work of time."

The varied learning, classical, legal, historical, biblical, that Peyton condenses into his volume, excites our admiration, especially when we bear in mind that it was the work of a mere youth who did not live to bring it to perfection or maturity. We recall the achievements of Sackville, author of "The Induction,"

joint author of "Gorboduc," who prepared the way for the incoming glory of Marlowe, and himself abandoned literature for a political career, at the dawning age of twenty-six.

That Peyton was familiar with the Faust legend is evident from stanza 79, Part ii. Historical allusions, such as that to Elizabeth of Bohemia, stanza 143, Part i, forms like *pester*, *bepester*, which survive in America, words such as the Elizabethan *adust*, *idolize* in the sense of committing or practising idolatry, stanza 145, Part ii, require no comment or detailed explanation. It has been my purpose to point out such forms and expressions as are characteristic of the author and his epoch; whatever is merely general and not distinctive, has been, for the most part, ignored.

That Peyton's "Glasse of Time," in any marked degree influenced Milton's supreme epic, as to choice of theme, or mode of treatment, is a claim that cannot be made good by scientific analysis, or by any of the processes recognized by the student of comparative literature. Even with this abatement the work has the charm of strong individuality, as well as a rare vocabulary, and is worthy of revival in an age abounding in literary resurrections. For the special investigator of the Elizabethan and Jacobean time, it has a unique attraction. We cordially acknowledge the kindly offices of our Virginia friend, whose cultured tastes and sympathies have been instrumental in rousing it from the long slumber during which it came perilously near to complete oblivion.

HENRY E. SHEPHERD.

College of Charleston.

ULRICH VON HUTTEN.

Ulrichs von Hutten Deutsche Schriften. Untersuchung nebst einer Nachlese von SIEGFRIED SZAMATÓLSKI. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1891. (*Quellen und Forschungen*, No. 67).

AMONG the many interesting figures which greet us on the threshold of modern German history, there is none—even Luther not excepted—more attractive than that of the scholar-knight with the laurel of the poet, the valiant champion of Humanism and the Reformation, Ulrich von Hutten.

For him more than for any of his contemporaries, life was a continual struggle. Sent to the monastery when a child, to become a monk according to the will of his father, he escaped and suffered all the hardships and privations of utmost poverty and a severe, tedious and almost hopeless sickness, and yet he never fell away from manliness, never did his indomitable fortitude and courage abandon themselves to despair, and all his writings are full of spirit and vigor.

It is this which conquers our sympathy for the pugnacious knight who entered with fervor into the battle for the political and religious liberty of his beloved country, and fought in it with a noble recklessness as to the consequences that might arise from it for his own person. Indeed, whatever Hutten's faults may have been—and he had faults—nobody can reproach him with littleness or insincerity of character, and when we see him as far removed from Luther's narrow-mindedness as from Reuchlin's or Erasmus' faint-heartedness, we understand that Eoban Hesse, at the news of his death exclaimed: *Eras totus amabilis*.

As Strauss states in his excellent biography* "the nurse of Hutten's genius was indignation." Indeed from that midwinter-day (December, 1509) when the poor poet had been robbed by his enemies of his warm clothing, to that letter in which Hutten commissions his friend Eoban Hesse to get his work against tyrants printed (July 21, 1523), from the very beginning of his literary career to the 'Swan song' on his death bed, it is always indignation that lent his pen its greatest strength and most brilliant colors. It is significant for this quality of Hutten's mind that even in the renowned 'Epistles of the Obscure Men,' which seem all jokes and jests and fun, the part attributed to our knight betrays more earnestness, showing the pathos beneath the irony: he never forgets that injustice and stupidity must not only be ridiculed, but also combated.

And the more important the objects are which call forth his indignation, the more his writings increase in vigor. In the 'Querelae' he takes revenge on his personal enemies for

their brutality; the 'Orations against Duke Ulrich of Württemberg' and 'Phalarismus' show the chivalrous knight as the advocate of his family, calling to account the hot-headed murderer of his cousin. In the 'Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum,' he embraces the cause of humanism against the ignorance and stupidity of scholasticism. The highest point of literary merit, however, is reached in his writings on the great questions of the time; never is Hutten more eloquent, never does he speak with more effective pathos and power of persuasion, than when he sends forth his rhetorical thunderbolts against the Romish supremacy in Germany, which he regarded as the root of all evil, and which he held responsible for the ecclesiastical and political distress in his fatherland.

It appears from this characteristic of Hutten's literary work, that he could take but a very slight interest in purely religious matters; to tell the truth, he was too deeply permeated with the humanistic indifference to all dogmatic questions to pay any attention to Luther's 'theological quarrel.'

Not until he saw that Luther, from different premises, had reached the same conclusions, did Hutten espouse his cause and become the 'guardian of the evangelical doctrine,' the 'champion of the word of God.'

We should not forget, however, that the keynote of Hutten's sentiments was the desire to win for Germany political liberty and independence from Rome; to do away with the political leading-strings by which the Pope held the Emperor and the fatherland; to put an end to all papal exertions and aggressions. And it is in pursuing this object that Hutten's writings show a warmth and, sometimes, vehemence of language which come from the inmost depths of his manly and vigorous mind. It is noteworthy that, even in 1521, Hutten does not know a better title for himself than the 'Champion of German liberty,' as we find it on the title-page of the 'Bull-Slayers.' To carry out his patriotic schemes, such as he had set forth in his 'Address to the Turks' (1518), he even brought himself to lay aside long-cherished prejudices. In order that the Empire may be re-established in its mediæval glory, all classes of the people must make

*Translated into English by Mrs. G. Sturge, London, 1874.

sacrifices, especially the princes, for unity and unconditioned obedience to the Emperor are the two things most needful. And when the princes refused to coöperate and continued to pursue their selfish interests, Hutten proffered his hand to the burghers whom he had formerly so despised, and advocated an alliance between the nobles and the cities, to effect the religious and political reforms. It is the dialogue entitled 'The Robbers' (1521) that marks this turning point in Hutten's ideas and projects. But before the proud knight succeeded in throwing aside his class prejudices, he had already conquered those of his literary traditions as a humanist, which would not allow him to write in German. Hutten always claimed—and with good reasons—that he "had, before Luther, opposed papal tyranny, revealed the papal imposture, annihilated the power of bulls, closed Germany against indulgences and all such jugglery."

We may even attribute to his 'Vadiscus' a decisive influence on Luther's resolution to renounce the Pope, since this manifesto against Rome appeared in April 1520, and Luther's work on the 'Babylonish Captivity of the Church' not until October of the same year. It has hitherto been a generally accepted opinion that Hutten did not begin to write German until after the publication of Luther's 'Address to the German Christian nobles.' Mr. Szamatólski, however, proves in his very interesting book that while no German writings were published under Hutten's name before 1520, Hutten had certainly commenced to write in German before that date, and some of his writings had even been published, although anonymously.

It seems strange that Strauss, as well as Mr. Szamatólski, forget to connect the name of Sickingen with Hutten's change from Latin to German. Mr. Szamatólski proves that Hutten, as early as February 1519, wrote the translation of 'Febris i' for this newly-won friend and protector; as this is his first German work, the conjecture does not appear too bold that the intercourse with Sickingen, who knew but little Latin, first suggested to Hutten the idea of writing in German. To this powerful and hardy knight, who then had given him shelter at Ebernburg, Hutten also dedicated in 1520

the translation of his four dialogues 'Febris i and ii,' 'Vadiscus' and 'the Spectators.'

The great merit of Mr. Szamatólski's book, besides its valuable stylistic researches, is that it shows for the first time the relation and mutual influence of Hutten's German work and the development of his political opinions. For, in opposition to the current opinion, Mr. Szamatólski proves that Hutten's resolution to write in German was not so abrupt and accidental as it has hitherto been regarded: 'When Hutten in the fall of 1520 brandishes the sword of his native tongue against his adversaries, he does not handle a weapon to which he is unaccustomed and which he has only snatched up in the fury of the battle, but a well-tested one, which he has chosen and prepared in time for the great fight.'

This is the well-founded conclusion at which Mr. Szamatólski arrives. Mr. Szamatólski, however, offers not only a literary vindication of Hutten, whose German work had not met with due appreciation before, but also the knight's apparent wavering up to the time of, and during, the diet of Worms is explained. After what has been said about Hutten's indifference to purely theological matters, we may easily understand how immediately before Luther's coming to Worms, Hutten was ready to exert his personal influence upon the great reformer, to make him revoke his open and much-condemned attacks upon the Catholic creed.

There is one more word to be said about the *Pfaffenkrieg*. Mr. Szamatólski explains the development of the idea of such a war from its first conception, after Hutten had heard that he had been placed on the Roman list of proscription, down to the real outbreak of hostilities of the fatal conclusion of the diet of Worms. * Hutten, in whom the author and the knight were contending with each other all his life, tried to organize from his friend's castles, besides the spiritual warfare, an actual campaign against the emissaries and adherents of Rome, and it is shown by the reports of the nuncio how great an importance was attributed to his threats, apparently backed by the power of Franz von Sickingen. But the latter refused to coöperate with Hutten in his projects of force, and so Hutten saw himself alone in the very moment when he had

meant to draw the sword, immediately before the opening of the diet, and he had again to take up the pen and to adapt himself to the different, constantly changing, phases of the discussions and transactions at Worms. After Luther's departure from the diet, Hutten proceeded to the execution of his long-cherished plans, and looked at from this point of view, the feuds from the fall of 1521 to the fall of 1522 appear no longer in the light of petty personal quarrels, in which he gave vent to his ill humor at the failure of his great schemes; they form part of his great 'war against the priests.' In the last years of his life, Hutten's fate is closely connected with that of the ambitious lord of Ebernburg. It was Sickingen who induced him, in the spring of 1520, to give up all at once his dreams of a simple and peaceful life as a scholar and to enter into the open arena of politics. And with the downfall of Sickingen, all the hopes of Hutten were destroyed. Whatever may have been the real motives of Sickingen's attack on the Elector of Treves, we cannot doubt that it appeared to Hutten as Sickingen's final espousal of his own political schemes. "The campaign was not undertaken," as the address to the troops and allies says, "to increase the Renish knight's wealth or power, but for God's honor, for it was directed against the enemies of the Gospels, the bishops and priests."

The princes, however, considered the expedition as a dangerous attack on their power on the part of the nobles, and so Hutten's safety was no longer endangered by the Romanists only, but also by the princes who persecuted in him one of the most active instigators of this revolt against their rule. He was compelled to leave Germany and take shelter in Switzerland, where he died in the utmost poverty on one of the last days of August, or the first of September, 1523.

MAX BLAU.

Boston.

ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLES.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicles from 800-1001 A.D. Edited, with introduction, notes and a complete glossary, by J. F. DAVIS, D.Lit., M.A. (Lond.). London: Whittaker & Co., 1889. 8vo, viii+102 pp.

Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel (787-1001 A.D.) with supplementary extracts from the others. A Revised Text. Edited, with introduction, critical notes, and *glossary by CHARLES PLUMMER, M.A., etc. On the basis of an edition by John Earle, M.A., etc. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889. 8vo, xvi+136 pp.

THESE two little books are designed primarily to meet the needs of students reading for the London University B.A. examination, but will be found admirably adapted to the purposes of beginners in Old English, by reason not only of the ease and purity of the material, but also because of the convenient shape in which it is presented. So much being premised it remains to notice them both in detail.

The introduction of Dr. Davis occupies itself with the sources of the annals, the mode and origin of their compilation, the sources of the text, the character of the present edition—all in four pages. The student will rise from its perusal with only the vaguest idea of the subject; and it would have been better to devote the page and a half given to a succinct account of all the MSS. to a more extended description of A. and E., their relative values and contents, since on these two MSS. alone the text is based. *p* in the list of contractions is to be corrected to *þ*. The table of abbreviations on page vii would be more convenient if printed on p. 76 where it properly belongs.

The text is based on A. and E. exclusively, the aim being to present a "full account of the period from 800-1001 as far as the events are recorded in the MSS. A. and E." The text is fair and distinct, accents being those of the MSS. only. A careful collation with Earle and Plummer presents the following variations and errors:

P. 1, l. 11. *Steall*; *Steal* P. E.—p. 15, 26, *cuomon*; so E., *comon* P.—19, 7. *paer é*; read *paer[e] é* with P.—20, 11. *enforan*; misprint for *onforan*—21, 24. *Alfred*; so E. *Aelfred*, P.—23, 16. *Aepered, waes*; read *Aepered [se] waes*, if *[se]* be permissible at 24, 13; if not omit both as P. E. have neither—24, 26. read 910 (E). *And her*, with E. and P.—25, 12. *Eowils*; *Ecwils* P. E.—25, 33. *Mercaena*; *Myrcena*, P. E.—26, 31. *Eadwearde* is contrary to syntax and P. E.; omit the final *e*.—28, 31. *teonan*; so E. but *teonun*, P. as cited in glossary also—29, 1.

foran; *foron*, P. E.—31, 18. *sweoda*; misprint for *sweorda*.—31, 19. *Brunanburh*; so E. *Brunanburh* P., also Wülker in 'K.A.D.' and the revised Grein, the latter with the remark *undeutlich*.—32, 10. *heardes*; *hecardes*, E. P.—32, 20. *cread cneor on*, with MSS. B. C. and Wheloc, Wülker (G.² and 'K.A.D.'). Etm. G.¹, Rieger, Körner; *cread cnearen*, E. P.—32, 28. *forgrunden*. MSS. B. C. D. with Wheloc and Wülker (G.² and 'K.A.D.'). *fergrunden*. P. E.—33, 25. 940; 941 P. E. rightly; see P. note on 893.—33, 26. xl; xli P. E.—33, 31. 941; 942 P. E.—34, 9. No good reason occurs to the reviewer why the parts of annal 941 should be separated as by Dr. Davis. Such separation mutilates the text. Join 943 (A) with 941 (A) as with E. P. Wülker (G.² 'K.A.D.') and read,

*afera Eadweardes, Edmund cyning,
on feng Anlase cyninge etc.*

This may spoil the looks of the poem, but is conformable to the MSS.—34, 18. *eal to*; *to eal*, P. E.—35, 6. [*And . . . lande*]; so E. with MS. F., but P. follows A. dating the entry 956.—35, 8. [*Her . . . Lundene*]; so E. but P. with MSS. A. F. 959—36, 17. *nigila*; *nigilia*, P. E. also Davis in glos.—48, 10. Annal number 1001 omitted.—48, 15. *Aepelweard*; misprint for *Aepelweard*.—49, 3. *elaf*; read *fela*.

Five hundred and forty-two notes are given to 1583 lines; of these three hundred and seventy-six are perfectly dispensable. The very dullest beginner does not need notes like 45, 22. *wið heora feondum*, 'From their foes'; 46, 8. *cumon=cuman*; 43, 22. *an=on*; 41, 24. *wide gefrege*='widely known.' Such notes serve only to make the student lazier. Cross references should not be given so frequently. Repetition of notes affect memories; yet we are told the use of *healf* in five separate notes; 16, 18. is referred to three times; 22, 1, 22, 3, 22, 19, etc., seven times. Only fifteen notes are over four lines long; only twenty-eight are over three lines; the large majority are only one line in length. Real difficulties are not met; and we are surprised to find no notes on annal 852 E. as a whole; the genealogies in 855; the list of Bretwaldas in 827; the recording of eclipses, comets, on 802 *sequens*; *pallium*. 804; *Angelcynnes Scolu* in 816 with 894; 823, *fierd* should be distinguished from *here*; 853, office and duties of *wiotan*;

the two poems, 937 and 941; the procedure narrated in 963 E., the rights and privileges granted, etc. The space given to three hundred and seventy-six picayune notes might well have been used in the elucidation of these matters.

In the glossary we have to notice the following: *Acennan*, 'to beget, bear,' not 'to be born'; *Aduent* is not 'the first Sunday in Advent,' see 963 E.; *Aeglea*, to 'see note,' add: p. 57; *aepete*, read *aepet*; *anstracces*, read *anstreces*, see p. 19; after *behienan*, add *behindan*; *beom* should follow *beorht*; after *betweox* add *bewuna* (see 1001) and strike out *wuna* altogether; *bilgebleht*, misprint for *bilgesleht*; insert *bradbrim* (937 A); *Bretwalda* . . . see note, add p. 52; insert *Battington* (894), *Caln* (978); *Clofeshoo*, see note, add p. 52; *crism-lising* . . . see notes, add p. 58; *cyncg* (1001 A), *cynincg* (1001 A) are variants of *cyning* and should be given; insert *diacon*, (963 A), *engel*, 'angel' (975); *epelturf*, read *turf*, *yin* 875 because dative; *faege*, strike out 'slain'; *feax* omit as only in *blandenfeax* (837); add *feowertig* (894); *forgiuness*, omit final s; add *forhrape*, adv. 'quickly' (921); *From*, a river (955); *gewildan*, read *gewealdan*; omit *gifa*, only in comp. *beahgifa*; add *gold*. (1001 A); om. *hafoc*, only in *guphafoc*; add *hasupad* (937 A); *Hwiccium* . . . see note, add p. 51; *Iglea* omit; *Lidwiccium*, . . . see note, add p. 59; *Limen*. add p. 60; omit *hacela*, and add *maessehacela* (963 E.); omit *plega*, only in *hondplega*; omit *ring*, only in *hildering*; *sacu*, add p. 70; add *saendan* see *sendan*; omit *sleht*, *steort*, *stream* only in comps.; *team*, p. 70; add *tocnawlece*, 'expressly' (963 E.), *pencan* (921), *ungepwaernus* (867), *waest* (see *weast*); *wealhgefera* add p. 63; *wealwudu* add p. 57; *Wirhealas* also in sg. at 895.

We expected more careful and accurate work from the translator of Kluge, and hope these errors will be corrected in the second edition the book deserves. Barring these, teachers will find this volume quite useful and convenient in elementary work.

The book of Mr. Plummer is part of a larger work; namely, a complete recasting of the edition of Prof. Earle, published in 1865 and now out of print. We have here the well-known features of the edition of Earle, the two

main texts in parallel columns, the supplementary extracts, and the critical foot notes. In all these Mr. Plummer displays accurate scholarship and sound judgment, while the Clarendon Press *imprimatur* means the usual perfection of mechanical execution. The introduction touches briefly and well the MS. sources of the text and the general historic outline of the period.

We have, however, a few corrections to note in the glossary: insert '*abisgod* see *abysgian*'; *acennedness*, *dnness*, *baernett*, *bliss*, *gelicness*, *gescyldness*, *geþwaærness*, *gewinn*, *gewiss*, *gewitness*, *sibsumness*, *þwaærness*, omit final letter in accordance with 'Cook-Sievers', p. 127-128; insert *Aduent* (863), *aetowian* ['v. *actywan*'] *ana*. 'alone, 972, 978,' *daelf* 'dike 963,' *dun* 'sf. hill,' *Iglea* referred to under *Aeglea* yet omitted, *laefan* 'wv. leave,' *ungeþwaærnes*, see *unþwaærnes*; *aloð*, strike out 's. ealo' and read 's. indecl. *ale* 852 E'; *béntigðe*, after 'prayer,' add 'successful'; *daëdból* is rather 'repentance, penance'; *éa*, definition, 'river, stream' omitted; omit *ealo* 'which is not nom. of *aloð* as per Cook-Sievers' 282, N. 2; *gemana* should precede *ge-mannian* just as *Stánford*, *stánweall*; *þurfan*, *þurh* and, *wisdóm*, *wise*.

Either of these works would form admirable material for early instruction or parallel reading; but, in all fairness, we must give the palm to the book of Mr. Plummer for scientific accuracy, critical acumen and intelligent perception of the beginner's needs. The price too is in its favor; it costing but three shillings to the other's five.

R. B. WOODWORTH.

Duffields, W. Va.

GOTHIC PRIMER.

A Primer of the Gothic Language, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary, by JOSEPH WRIGHT, Ph.D., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1892. 12mo, pp. 247.

Dr. Wright's 'Gothic Primer' is the third in a series of Germanic primers by the same author (Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iii, pp. 203-204, and vol. v, pp. 53-54). It is by far the most

scholarly and most complete of them, going really beyond the scope of a mere primer; the phonology alone fills sixty-five pages.

That the treatment of the subject is based on scientific principles and embodies the latest results—as far as they are touched upon—was to be expected of the translator of Brugmann's 'Comparative Grammar.' The first part contains the Phonology of the Gothic language (pp. 2-66); is very carefully done, clear and precise, and well-suited to lead the beginner safely through the labyrinth of Primitive Germanic phonetics. A few additions would have made this section complete even for the advanced student, who will especially miss in this book a historical treatment of the *ablaut*. Grassmann's law ought to have been stated; so much the more so as some illustrations in Greek and Sanskrit are given that cannot be understood by the beginner without a knowledge of the cause of these exceptions. (Cf. p. 48.)—P. 15. Why not print sonant nasals and liquids *ŋ*, *ŋ*, *ŋ*, *ŋ*, instead of *l*, etc.?—P. 19, *g* (Lat. *or*, Gr. *ap*, *pa*) is said to have become *ur*; *ŋ* (Lat. *ol*, Gr. *al*, *la*) > *ul*, *lu*. For *lu* no example is given. Beside *ur*, *ru* ought to have been mentioned; cf. Skr. loc. plur. *bhrātṛ-ṣu*, Gothic *brōþru-m*.—P. 64, § 139, section 3 should read: "ð became þ after vowels, both finally and before -s."

The *accidence* (pp. 66-126) is a simplified presentation of the corresponding part in Braune's 'Gotische Grammatik.'—P. 93, *fidurragineis*, 'tetrarchate,' which occurs only in Luke iii, 1, as dat. sg. *fidurraginja* had better be given as neuter, *fidurragini*. Misprints occur on p. 103, *haitáu*, instead of *hāitáu*; and p. 104, note i: *nēm-eiwa* for *nēm-eiwa*.

Chapter xv (pp. 127-139) contains an outline of the syntax, tolerably complete for a primer; it is mostly drawn from Douse's 'Introduction to the Gothic of Ulfilas.'

After a concise account of the life of Ulfilas, the extant MSS., and a bibliography of the most indispensable works on Gothic, follow fifty-four pages of text, taken from the eighth edition of Heine's 'Ulfilas'; the diphthongs and quantities are marked throughout. In the Notes care has been taken to elucidate difficult constructions by references to the Greek text. A short chapter on Gothic spell-

ing and the pronunciation of Greek proper names and loan-words completes the volume.*

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

Le Rime di Tullia D' Aragona Cortigiana del Secolo xvi. edite a cura e studio di Enrico Celani. Bologna: Romagnoli Dall'Acqua, 1891. 8vo, pp. lxiii and 199. (*Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie.*)

FROM the view-point of morals, the picture which the life of Tullia d'Aragona presents to us, as depicted by Celani in this volume, is by no means an edifying one. If the beginning of the sixteenth century in Italy was, on the one hand, a period of great culture and mental activity, it was, on the other, stained by the deepest vices. It was in lyrical poetry above all things, the age of the *Petrarchisti*,—Petrarch was the idol before whom the *rimatori* of the sixteenth century prostrated themselves, and beside the ideal, platonic love of the *cantor di Laura* these poets sang "at the same time and in the same manner the love for the *cortigiana*." The warped moral character of this period of the Italian *rinascimento* is thus strikingly characterized by Gaspary:

"L'Amore platonico per dame altolocate, il quale vive piu nella fantasia che nel cuore, quando non è del tutto una finzione di moda, e l'amore per la cortigiana cantano codesti poeti nello stesso tempo ed alla stessa guisa. Bernardo Tasso celebra Ginevra Malatesta e Tullia d'Aragona; il Molza, Camilla Gonzaga e la spagnuola Beatrice. Questa mescolanza dell'affetto sensuale e dello spirituale, questa mancanza di scrupoli per macchie morali, sono caratteristiche del tempo, e la dama virtuosa stessa non se ne scandalizza punto. In un sonetto (*Molza, che al ciel*) Vittoria Colonna parla al Molza della sua Beatrice; nondimeno è pur da osservare, che ella loda non già la persona cantata, etc."

*The reviewer has had a Gothic grammar in preparation for some time, but frequent interruptions have delayed its appearance. As far as the MS. is ready, it follows the plan of Wright's 'Primer' so closely that its publication in this form seems superfluous. He would gratefully receive the opinions of his colleagues as to the merits of the 'Gothic Primer' as a working text-book in our universities, and any suggestions as to changes and additions which would serve to make the book more complete and perhaps better suited to the wants of American students.

† *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* di Adolfo Gaspary, trad. da Vittorio Rossi. Torino: Loescher, 1891. Vol. II, part II, p. 132. The best account of Tullia d'Aragona will be found in the same volume, pp. 136-160.

That in such an age, a courtesan should receive the homage of poets and men of genius, need cause no wonder, for the story is an old one. Celani has well said: "These (men of letters) were then as now, and as perhaps unfortunately they will always be, richer in genius, in madrigals and in epistles than in money." Antonio Brocardo wrote in praise of the *cortigiane*, Varchi exalted the *Aragona*, Michael Angelo Buonarroti, *Faustina Mancina*; and Niccolò Martelli, *madonna Salterella*. But to us it must seem a strange spectacle that the Marchesa di Pescara, whom the world has always considered a very paragon of womanly virtue and nobility of soul, should consider it not unworthy of herself to notice such a person in her poetry; and doubtless Donna Eleonora di Toledo, Duchess of Florence, considered with feelings not unmixed with pride, the dedication of the poems of such a celebrity as Tullia d'Aragona. It is a curious chapter in the history of human frailty—this clinging to one another's skirts in the hope of a transient immortality.

"The barrier which had precluded all women from culture in the Middle ages being once broken, the *rinascimento* led to two opposite extremes;—to a positive and serious culture, on the one hand to license, the result of a misunderstood liberty, which lead, in its turn, as an inevitable antithesis, to the education of the cloister."

The appearance of the *cortigiana* at the beginning of the sixteenth century is discussed at some length by Celani, who thereby justifies the century of its darker moral predecessors. "Lo sviluppo della *cortigiana* . . . viene certamente a smentire l'asserzione che il cinquecento fosse l'età piu feconda di turpi vizii, etc." The *cortigiane* were not long in availing themselves of the culture with which they were surrounded; they vied with the *donne oneste* in learning and refinement, and thus at the beginning of the century, we find beside such names as Vittoria Colonna and Veronica Gamba, two *cortigiane*, Tullia d'Aragona and Veronica Franco.

Tullia d'Aragona was born at Rome, the daughter of a *cortigiane* Giulia Campana of Ferrara and Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona. The year of her birth is unknown, but according to Celani, was probably about 1510. Of her

youth, little has come down to us; she lived probably in Florence in 1517 and 1518, afterwards in Siena and then "vedendo la madre che costei haveva di virtù principio grande considerò che Roma è terra da donne, e massime che ella sapea l'usanza della corte e così l'ha fatta cortigiana." We are told that at an early age she wrote Latin and Italian, that she had the most exquisite manners, and that she played and sang so that "i primi professori degli esercizi ne restavano meravigliati." She spoke with rare grace and eloquence, and "like another Cleopatra she knew how to captivate the souls of her listeners."

In personal appearance Tullia is described as tall, not beautiful, but agreeable (*piacevole*), with eyes "bellissimi e splendidissimi, e nei movimenti loro una certa forza vivace che pareva gittassero fuoco negli altrui cuori"; hair of a golden blonde "often praised by her admirers, among whom was Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici, whom the purple did not prevent from burning his grain of incense before *la bella Aragonese*." Her portrait, painted by Alessandro Bonvicino, called *il Moretto*, is preserved in the *pinacoteca Tosio* in Brescia.

This glowing description of the poetess in no way agrees with that given by Giral di in the vii novel of his 'Ecatommiti,' "but the odium which Giral di shows in speaking of Tullia, makes us," as Celani says, "if not believe, at least suspect, that *invano abbia picchiato alla porta della bella cortigiana*." Indeed the loose-tongued and malevolent Giral di even denies her *any* personal beauty,—says she had a large mouth, thin lips and a long nose "gibbuto et nella estrema parte grosso et atto a porre sommo difetto in ogni bella faccia s'egli tra le guancie vi fosse posto."

It were useless here to trace Tullia in all her peregrinations. She was in Rome in 1531 and in Venice in 1535, where her sister Penelope was born, and where she was courted by Bernardo Tasso and Speroni. This sister, who died in 1549, also bore the name of *Aragona*, at which Celani remarks "quasi la Giulia ferrarese per essere un tempo stata l'amante di un cardinale di casa Aragona avesse il diritto di chiamare Aragonesi anche i figliuoli nati parecchi lustri dopo che il buon cardinale aveva reso l'anima a Dio."

The report of Tullia's noble origin, as Gaspari says, was not without its effect "si che molti sarrebbero corsi dietro a Tullia *per nobilitarsi*." In 1537 we find her in Ferrara, where she had arrived a few days after Vittoria Colonna. One of her admirers, in a letter to Isabella d'Este speaking of this *gentil cortigiana di Roma* says: "Questa è molto gentile, discreta, accorta et di ottimi et divini costumi dotata: . . . non c'è donna in questa terra che la paregi, anchora che la Ill. ma S. ra Marchesa di Pescara sia, ecc., ma, etc." She was now at the very height of her success, surrounded by poets and *gentiluomini* who flattered and courted her "and put the lie upon her not very honorable past by recognizing in her only the poetess, the descendant of the *sangue real*." Muzio and Bentivoglio showered praises upon her in prose and verse and Tullia was exalted above Vittoria Colonna. *Ancora una volta la cortigiana trionfava.*

In 1543 Tullia was married at Siena to Silvestro Guicciardi of Ferrara, a husband who seems to have caused her no inconvenience, for he never again appears upon the scene. The Siennese documents show that she was "legally at least," the daughter of Costanzo Palmieri d'Aragona, for she is called Tullia Palmeria de Aragonia. Here in 1544 she was accused of residing in a quarter of the city, and of wearing clothing and ornaments forbidden to the *meretrici* by the statutes of the commune. Of this she was acquitted, the judgment being "D. Tulliam de Aragona Sen. habitantem, non esse comprehensam in statuto meretricium, dantes licentiam omnibus et quibuscumque personis locandi domos dicte domine Tullie, et absque aliqua pena, etc." (p. xxxiii). In August of the same year she was accused of wearing the *sbernia* at Easter;—of this she was likewise acquitted, "fuit declaratum sibi licere portare sberniam instantibus omnibus, etc." Toward the close of 1545, Tullia is again in Florence, and fortune again seemed to favor her. Here she gained the friendship of Varchi, Martelli and others, who mention her in their poems and letters, but here once more in 1547 her evil fate overtook her. In April she was summoned before a magistrate, under a law promulgated by Duke Cosimo in October 1546, which obliged

cortigiane to wear a yellow veil, or something of a yellow color, to distinguish them from *oneste gentildonne*. Doubtless Tullia thought, on account of her fame as a poetess, that she was no longer included in the class to which this law referred. She had recourse to Don Pedro de Toledo, nephew of the Duchess Eleonora, who advised her to send a petition to the Duchess, accompanied by a copy of the sonnets written to her "da illustri letterati." The petition had the desired effect, Duke Cosimo *di suo pugno* endorsing upon it "Fasseli gratia per poetessa."² In 1548 Tullia is in Rome and here she fell again into her former course of life, "perhaps obliged by necessity, perhaps induced by her evil genius, her mother Giulia."³ In the book of 'Taxes upon courtesans for bridge-repairs,' it appears that she paid for her apartments a rent of forty scudi, and was taxed, in proportion four scudi "and she was one of the *cortigiane* who paid the most." Tullia lived in Rome until her death, which took place on the twelfth or thirteenth of March, 1556, in the house of an inn-keeper, Matteo Moretti, in the Trastevere quarter, and here on the second of March she made her last will, which Celani gives entire,—taken from the state Archives at Rome. After a few minor bequests, chiefly of articles of clothing, she leaves the residue of her property to a boy Celio, under the guardianship of one Messer Pietro Cioccha, with the condition that the effects be sold, and the money placed at interest for the benefit of the said Celio, to serve "per imparare littere et altre virtù," and to receive the principal at the age of twenty-five. Of this Celio, who in another writing is called not only her heir but also her son, nothing is known, an examination of the archives of Rome not having revealed anything concerning his fate.

Such is the pathetic close of a career once so brilliant. "None of the poets who had courted her, sang her death, as was then the custom. Her last years had extinguished the glory that once surrounded her."

² It was in this year, 1547, that Tullia dedicated her "Rime" to the Duchess of Florence, and that they were first printed at Venice.

³ Gaspari, *Op. cit.*, 160. Celani gives the date of her arrival in Rome, as before February 1, 1537—as her sister Penelope died there on that date, followed shortly afterward by her mother (p. xxxvi).

In addition to the "Rime" which Celani here publishes, Tullia wrote a "Dialogo dell' infinità di amore," which has been described as

"one of the most vivacious dialogues that we possess, in the lower rank of the *scritti letterari* of the sixteenth century, . . . on account of a certain freedom and grace, and also, at times, a certain Florentine flavor which she perchance acquired through her intimacy with Florentines, and especially with Varchi;"

and a poem in *ottava rima* called "Il Meschino e il Guerino," which Tullia says she took from an old Spanish romance, and which has been much praised by Crescimbeni. And though in the preface Tullia inveighs against the wickedness of some of the *novelle* in the Decamerone, the extracts given by Celani show that her poem now and then betrays the slipperiness of the time in which it was written.

The "Rime" of Tullia d'Aragona are certainly not without poetic merit, but, perhaps, they would not be republished to-day had they been written by some less-known member of that numerous band of *Petrarchisti* of the sixteenth century; a morbid interest will, however, always be attached to them because of the strange life of their author. Dedicated to the Duchess of Florence, they are nearly all eulogistic of the Ducal family or of Tullia's poet-friends. Altogether, the volume before us contains fifty-five poems by Tullia, all sonnets except two: the rest of the book is made up of poems, chiefly sonnets written to her by others, thirty being by Girolamo Muzio,—also an eclogue "Le Amorse." No trace of the life that Tullia lead is visible in her "Rime," which are lofty and spiritual in the highest degree. She has been called a *Petrarchista* of the first-water, and in the age in which she lived, she could not well be otherwise. The Platonic and ideal love of her great master, we find once more glorified in the sonnets of Tullia. She has been much admired for her erudition and philosophic culture, and her sole desire seems to have been "to pass down to posterity together with the men of letters whom she sang, and to make every endeavor to cover up the courtesan beneath the poetess."

Of Tullia's poetic skill, these two sonnets to "Il giovane Manelli," for whom alone, ac-

according to Celani, she had an affection which we may believe sincere, may serve as an example.

xliii.

Se ben pietosa madre unico figlio
perde talora, e nuovo, alto dolore
le preme il tristo e suspiroso core,
spera conforto almen, spera consiglio.
Se scaltro capitano in gran periglio,
mostrando alteramente il suo valore,
resta vinto e prigion, spera uscir fuore
quando che sia con baldanzoso ciglio.
S'in tempestoso mar giunto si duole
spaventato nocchier già presso a morte
ha speme ancor di rivedersi in porto.
Ma io, s'avvien che perda il mio bel sole,
o per mia colpa, o per malvagia sorte,
non spero aver, nè voglio, alcun conforto.

xlv.

Ov'è (misera me) quell'aureo crine
di cui fe'rete per pigliarmi Amore
ov'è (lassa) il bel viso, onde l'ardore
nasce, che mena la mia vita al fine?
Ove son quelle luci alte e divine
in cui dolce si vive e insieme more?
ov'è la bianca man, che lo mio core
stringendo punse con acute spine?
Ove suonan l'angeliche parole,
ch'in un momento mi dan morte e vita?
u'i cari sguardi, u' le maniere belle?
Ove luce ora il vivo almo mio sole,
con cui dolce destin mi venne in sorte
quanto mai piovve da benigne stelle?

Sig. Celani, in a very interesting introductory essay, has gathered together all that is known, or that, perhaps, we care to know about this later Aspasia. He also promises to publish the *rime* of "the antithesis" of the fair Tullia, Veronica Franco, of whom he says:

"essa è l'incarnazione della donna libera del cinquecento ed è l'unica che canti liberamente i suoi amori: non s'informa a platonismo o castità irrisoria, ama per amare e soddisfare i sensi, e i suoi liberi amplessi, etc.,"

and doubtless the *bibliofili senza numero* are anxiously looking forward to the appearance of the *rime* of the frail Veronica; and there is a danger ahead, lest the two hundred and two copies in which the volumes in the *Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie* appear, may not go round.

H. A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

GOETHE.

Einführung in Goethes Meisterwerke. Selections from Goethe's Poetical and Prose Works, with copious Biographical, Critical, and Explanatory Notes, a Vocabulary of Difficult Words and an Introduction containing a Life of Goethe, by Dr. WILHELM BERNHARDT. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1891. 8vo, pp. xii, 275.

THIS book is Dr. Bernhardt's answer to the perplexing question how best to present to the student a symmetrical and fairly representative picture of the many-sided literary activity of not only the greatest, but also the most voluminous classical writer of Germany. In his search for a text-book suitable as a guide in a systematic literary study of Goethe's works, the author found the second volume of A. Lüben's 'Auswahl Charakteristischer Dichtungen und Prosastücke zur Einführung in die deutsche Litteratur' best adapted to his requirements. Actual use in the classroom of the sixty pages of this work devoted to Goethe, suggested additions, from time to time, of omitted poems, and extension of some of the briefer epic and dramatic selections, with accompanying biographical, literary and critical notes, until the almost doubled bulk of the resulting material suggested the publication of this 'Introduction to Goethe's Masterworks.'

The subject-matter, consisting of forty-two specimens of Goethe's epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry, and extracts from his Italian correspondence as well as from his biographical and historical prose, is wisely chosen. These specimens, either complete in themselves or, when fragmentary, ample enough to give an adequate idea of the works represented, supplemented by skillfully worded summaries of omitted passages taken chiefly from the commentaries of Lüben, Viehoff, Düntzer, Gude, Munckwitz, and Vilmar, are well adopted to the purpose of leading the student to an intelligent appreciation of the greatness and versatility of Goethe's genius.

The text of the selections is based upon that of Goedeke's critical Goethe Edition, modified in accordance with the new orthography.

The position at the end of the book of all mere word or phrase explanations prepares us

for the prevailingly literary character of the commentary. The latter, under such captions as, 'Inhalt,' 'Grundgedanke,' 'Form,' 'Quelle,' 'Litterarhistorisches,' reveals in the editor a keen literary perception, a fine sense of proportion, and the sure touch of a man whose expression is dictated by the successful experience of his own classroom. Marginal notes serve the double purpose of indicating, at a glance, the arrangement of subject-matter, and of furnishing convenient topics for oral or written discussion on the part of pupils, as a test of the thoroughness of their work. Illustrative quotations of similar poems by Goethe and others, expressive of the same or kindred moods, is an admirable feature of the editor's comments upon Nos. 6, 10 and 12. The literary notes are well calculated to stimulate, in the real student, a desire for a thorough and comprehensive study of German literature.

Chronological arrangement of the material, accurate indication of the chief sources, and immediate occasion of each work, careful analyses and summaries of omitted portions of the poems presented, brief but sufficient consideration of the metrical form of the lyric and epic numbers, Dr. Bernhardt's own suggestive criticisms, with his quotation of the characteristic utterances of English and American critics like Carlyle, Taylor, Boyesen, Lewes, and Emerson, and the 'Einleitung,' including a clear and succinct account of Goethe's 'Leben und Werke,' are among the many excellencies of the book that render it a worthy companion of the very best editorial work yet done in America in the field of modern languages.

Earnest teachers will cordially welcome this unique contribution to the means of effectively studying Goethe in our schools and colleges. May its success encourage the author to put us under further obligation to him by a similar presentation of other classical German writers! As it is primarily intended for the use of really advanced students of German, it seems to me desirable that a host of simple word-translations, easily supplied by any good dictionary, should be omitted in a second edition from the notes at the end of the volume.

The following slight errors have been noted: p. 15, 1, read, 'Kniee' for 'Knieen'; p. 16, 2,

omit 'the'; p. 30, 5, read 'sensuous' for 'sensual'; p. 35, 26, read, 'from time immemorial'; p. 43, 2, read 'was erected' for 'has been erected'; p. 46, 1, read 'no sooner said than done'; p. 60, 24, fails to show Goethe's error in deriving the name of the carriage from the (supposed) place of its manufacture, rather than from the appearance of Emperor Joseph I. in such a vehicle at the siege of Landau, 1702 (Düntzer); p. 73, 33, read 'by time' for 'by the time'; p. 94, 1, read 'tragedy' for 'dragedy'; 132, 3, read 'replaced' for 'substituted'; p. 151, 27, read 'eradicate' or 'extinguish' instead of 'abrogate'; p. 185, 11, read 'should' for 'would'; In the text, p. 140, 5, read *solltest* for *salltest*.

STARR W. CUTTING.

Earlham College.

MIDDLE ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Pearl: an English Poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited with a Modern Rendering by ISRAEL GOLLANCZ, M. A., of Christ's College, Cambridge. London: David Nutt, 1891. 8vo, pp. lii, 142.

Mr. Gollancz agrees with previous critics in regarding the poems found in the Cotton MS. Nero. A. x.,—"Pearl," "Cleanness," "Patience," and "Gawain and the Green Knight"—as the works of one author. He proposes to determine an approximate date for "Gawain" (and so relatively for the other poems of the group) in a new way. The editor believes that the incident after Gawain's return, of Arthur's commanding all the knights to wear a green girdle, has reference to the establishment of the Order of the Garter. The only external evidence adduced in support of this opinion is that a later hand has written at the end of the MS. of the poem the motto of the Order; and that in a ballad (see 'Percy Ballads') founded on this poem, the incident is given as the origin of the Order of the Bath,—the writer being "aware of its original application, but wishing to make his ballad topical." Another bit of evidence to support this view which Mr. Gollancz does not advance, is that in the episodes in Chrétien's "Perceval" upon which Gawain is founded, there is no incident of this nature: it seems to

be used for the first time by the author of "Gawain."

The Order of the Garter was established about 1345, and as a "number of Gawain romances appeared in the sixties and seventies of the century," the date of composition of "Gawain and the Green Knight" is placed about 1360.

The editor thinks, with other critics, that the author passed from the composition of "Gawain" to that of "Pearl," or *vice versa*. Miss M. Carey Thomas, in her dissertation, "Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight" (Zurich, 1883), maintains that "Pearl" preceded the other poems of the group; because, considering "Cleanness" and "Patience" later, she finds a closer relation between "Gawain" and "Cleanness" than between "Pearl" and "Cleanness." This view is based principally on the similarity in the description of the feasts in "Gawain," ll. 114-120, and in "Cleanness," ll. 91-123 and 1397-1406; and on the moral teaching of the two poems being the same.

These points of resemblance do not seem to me to indicate so near a relation as that which exists between "Pearl" and "Cleanness." Direct reminiscences of "Pearl" are found in "Cleanness," ll. 554-6, 1068, 1116-1128, 1132; and in ll. 1467-1472 a number of precious stones are named in almost the same order as in the description of the city in "Pearl," ll. 998-1015; besides, many parallels in single lines occur. Stronger evidence to my mind than this even for the later production of "Pearl," is its maturity of thought. The spirit of the poem shows that it is the song of a man who has passed through great sorrow, having now reached the height of a noble Christian resignation. In "Gawain" he was apparently just entering upon his ordeal. Placing "Gawain" first in the order of composition, then since "Pearl" is more nearly allied to "Cleanness" than to "Gawain," a number of years intervene before it was written; "Cleanness" and "Patience" follow in quicker succession.

Miss Thomas's arguments for supposing that 'Piers the Plowman' exerted some influence on "Cleanness" deserve more serious consideration than Mr. Gollancz accords them. If

the author had read, as Miss Thomas conjectures, the second edition of 'Piers the Plowman' before writing "Cleanness," the date of the production of "Cleanness" would be about 1380. Mr. Gollancz believes (see *Academy*, Aug. 8, 1891) "Pearl" was composed under the influence of Chaucer's translation of the 'Romaunt of the Rose.' If so, its date is about 1375.

There is another poem which Trautmann (*Anglia* v., *Anzeiger*, p. 21 ff.) considers a work of the author of "Pearl": this is the legend of St. Erkenwald, published in Horstmann's 'Altenglische Legenden' (Neue Folge), p. 265 ff. Mr. Gollancz misses in this poem the "peculiar strength of the author of 'Gawain';" but, as pointed out by Trautmann, in vocabulary, diction, and versification it is similar to the poems of the group. A mannerism of the author of "Pearl" is seen in postponing the preposition (cf. ll. 17, 141, 206, and somewhat less characteristic cases in ll. 125, 288, 328, 330). The story is told in concise, direct terms, without useless amplification, and it is especially remarkable for its effective use of the specific in description (cf. ll. 55, 70-71, 140). These qualities, generally so rare in Middle-English yet so striking in "Gawain," lend probability to Trautmann's theory. No more immediate relationship can be detected, however; and if "St. Erkenwald" is by the author of "Pearl," the absence of subjective elements indicates that it belongs to the author's early period—possibly between "Gawain" and "Pearl."

The editor joins the rest of the world in rejecting the theory that Huchown, mentioned by Andrew of Wynton, was the author of "Pearl." Huchown is almost certainly the author of the "Pystel of Susan" and of "Morte Arthure," and while several of the peculiar words and parallel expressions which Trautmann cites (*Anglia* i., p. 131 f.) to connect "Susan" and "Morte Arthure," are also found in the poems of the group,—and many others might be given,—still such is the real difference in style, versification, and vocabulary that the two sets of poems cannot have been written by the same author. An intimate relation exists, however, between these poems.

A new and interesting, but, unfortunately,

slenderly supported theory of authorship is advanced by Mr. Gollancz: he conjectures that the "philosophical Strode," to whom, with Gower, Chaucer dedicates "Troilus and Cressida," may have written "Pearl." Ralf Strode is mentioned among the worthies of Merton College as a poet: "*Radulphus Strode, nobilis poeta fuit et versificavit librum elegiacum vocatum Phantasma Radulphi.*" Ralf Strode was fellow as late as 1361, which accords well with the supposed date of the poems. The editor finds significance in Chaucer's having, in roguery, dedicated a poem which he must have recognized as free in tone, to the author of so chaste a work as "Pearl." The weight of testimony for Strode's authorship is not exaggerated by Mr. Gollancz: the theory so far is only a possible solution of a knotty problem.

The editor has studied the MS. of "Pearl" carefully, and gives a more accurate text than that of the previous edition. This edition "aims at gaining readers outside the limited circle of specialists;" but the requirements of specialists have been kept in view in preparing the work. The "Modern Rendering" is very free: the editor "attempts to do justice to the spirit of the original," which amounts in some cases to taking, what seem to me, unwarranted liberties with the text (cf., for example, 3. 11-12; 52. 1-2).

The notes explain satisfactorily many difficult passages of the poem, although some of doubtful meaning are yet to be cleared up. *To clantly clos in golde so clere* (1. 2) is rendered: "so deftly set in gold so pure;" yet the note explains: "'too cleanly enclosed' (i. e. for earthly existence)," and adds that the augmentative use of *to* is anomalous. At 52. 3, however, *to* must again be rendered 'so.' Moreover, a comparison of "Morte Arthure," l. 1109 or 1133 will show that *cleanly* has at this period (and retains still) the special meaning 'entirely'—in this passage possibly 'neatly,' or, as the editor himself well renders it, 'deftly'—but not 'cleanly'='purely.'

Strothe, in the line (10. 7), *Quen strothe men slepe*, is not satisfactorily explained by O. N. *stráð*, 'men sleeping beneath their thatches,' nor by O. N. *stroðinn* (cf. *Academy*, July 11, 1891, p. 36), 'when mortals sleep in one

another's embraces.' It is likewise difficult in this passage to connect *strothe* with A. S. *stráðan*, as Dr. Morris (*Academy*, June 27, 1891) suggests.

A happy emendation by Mr. Gollancz (*Academy*, July 11) is that of l. 12. 8: *By-twene myrthez by merez made*, to *By-twene merez by Myrthē made*, in which *Myrthē* is 'Sir Mirth' (*Déduis*) of the 'Romaunt of the Rose.' A reference to Prof. Zupitza's explanation of *bydene* ('Guy of Warwick,' l. 2408) would have been appropriate in a note (17. 4) on that word.

As possibly throwing light upon the difficult word, *werle* (18. 5), I suggest a comparison with *herle*, "Gawain," l. 190: *Ay a herle of ðe here, an oðer of golde*, referring both to M. E. *hwirlen*.

Mr. Gollancz offers an ingenious and, to my mind, probable explanation—although Dr. Morris (*Academy*, June 27) finds it unconvincing—of the obscure word *westernays* (26. 7), by connecting it with O. F. *bestorneis*, 'turned awry.' The explanation would be strengthened by citing a similar partial translation of a French word in "Cleanness," l. 1044: *apple-garnade*, which is, of course, 'pomegranate.'

Mr. Gollancz and the Bradley-Stratmann Dictionary (s. v. *endoren*) are surely wrong in assigning to *endorde* (31. 8) the meaning 'adored': *my dere endorde* clearly means 'my dear bright-shining-one.' Prof. James A. Harrison has a note on *endorrede* in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, p. 50, where he explains it as "Fr. *en+dorés*=gilded." Although *endorrede* ("Awntyrs of Arthure," l. 458) is in quite a different connection from that in which *endorde* is used in "Pearl," still it is probably the same word. Compare further *darielles endordide* ("Morte Arthure," l. 199), in which there is reduplication of the past participial ending, the meaning remaining, however, quite clear.

Spornande (31. 3) does not, I think, mean 'rushing,' but 'stumbling,' 'going wrong,' 'recalcitrant;' see the examples in the Bradley-Stratmann Dictionary, and more especially the sense of this passage.

The following errata have been noticed: The numbering of stanza 39 is omitted. 79. 3: *on e*: a misprint for *fonde*, which Morris has(?). 87. 4: for *patez* read *platez*.

In the notes the following need correction: 5.5: for 85. 5, 9 read 89. 5, 9. 10. 7: for 11. 8 read 11. 5. 12. 10: for 488 read 48. 8(?). 13. 7: for Gawain 2488 read Gawain 488. 14. 7: "cp. note 14. 5"—there is none: 17. 11(?). 40. 7: for 70. 12 read 71-2. 12(?). For 47. 4 read 47. 5.

A review of "Pearl" would be incomplete without mentioning the Pre-Raphaelite allegorical frontispiece by Mr. Holman Hunt, and the exquisite prefatory quatrain by the poet laureate with which Mr. Gollancz has enriched his beautiful and valuable edition.

THOMAS P. HARRISON.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

POPULAR ETYMOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Is the following instance of 'popular etymology' familiar to the readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES? On the marshes here is gathered the plant samphire, used for greens. Locally, however, only very few know or use the proper name, but it is always referred to as "sand fire." I might perhaps also mention that the farmers rarely say "marsh," but almost always 'mash,' with a very flat *a*.

W. M. TWEEDIE.

Mt. Allison College, Sackville, N. B.

CORRECTION.

In the last (May) number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, col. 315, l. 7: for *strong* read *strange*. *ibid.*, l. 18, insert *not* before *be*.

BRIEF MENTION.

In October of last year the new Danish Minister of Culture, Goos, appointed a commission consisting of representatives of the different classes of schools, to consider the subject of orthography. The rules of spelling published in 1889, during the ministry of Scavenius, have not won general approval, special opposition to them having been expressed by editors and authors. The commission is instructed to examine these rules with a view to modifying or entirely changing the most objectionable features, if this seem desirable. At present there are almost as many systems of orthography as there are religious sects in America. The commission is especially warned to proceed as cautiously as possible and to make only such suggestions as give

promise of real improvement. There is every reason to suppose that the most radical of Scavenius' changes will be suppressed and many of the claims of the so-called 'Literary Orthography' recognized.

From W. R. Jenkins (New York. Boston: Schoenhof) we receive new publications in each of his series. The first is a short comedy 'Bouderie,' in one act, by Maurice Lecomte, who evidently is a resident of New York.—The second is no. 17 of *Contes choisis* and is taken up with one story, 'le Chant du cygne' by Georges Ohnet, rather melancholy in its tone.—The third is an addition to the *Romans choisis*, of which it makes no. 19. It is a product of the *Prix Montyon*, and, notwithstanding that fact, is a bright love-story. The title is 'Mon oncle et mon curé,' and the author Jean de la Brète, of whom we know nothing, but suspect the name represents a pseudonym. The novel is a decided improvement in interest and style over its predecessor in the series.

Ginn & Co. send us three reprints of French texts published under the supervision of Prof. Bôcher of Harvard. They are Moilère's 'Misanthrope,' reproduced from the edition of 1667, Racine's 'Andromaque,' from that of 1697, and Montaigne's 'De l'Institution des enfants,' from the original text of 1580. These literal reproductions are of much service to advanced students of the language and syntax, and we hope to see their number increased, particularly from among the authors of the sixteenth century and of the first four decades of the seventeenth. The series to which these texts belong has been named the *International Modern Language Series*.

Belonging to the same series are two annotated texts, 'la Famille de Germandre,' by George Sand, edited by Augusta C. Kimball, and Erckmann-Chatrian's 'Madame Thérèse' with notice and notes by George W. Rollins. In the first named, the editor has followed the extreme of placing the burden of translation on the student. This plan is preferable to excessive annotation, but thirty notes for one hundred and six pages of text are far too few. They are not sufficient to justify editing.—'Madame Thérèse,' on the other hand, is judiciously and ably edited. There are but two notes in it which might be profitably changed, and they are of an historical bearing. The origin of the French flag is not as indicated on page 21, note 2 (see Chénel: 'Dictionnaire des Institutions'); and Provence (note 2, page 159) is but a small part, and perhaps not the most prolific, of the country of the Troubadours.

D. C. Heath & Co. have increased their French texts by the publication of Racine's 'Esther,' with introduction, notes and ap-

pendices by I. H. B. Spiers. The notes of this edition are thoroughly satisfactory but we have reservations to make regarding the page on the development of French tragedy, and the importance of Corneille in adapting its form to the requirements of acting. Of the appendices, the first on "French Verse" is hardly necessary after the remarks of Drs. Bowen and Matzke in the same series. The remaining four discuss grammatical points which embarrass every student, as that on the "Past Tenses in French," pp. xii-97. 25 cts.

An earlier addition to the *Modern Language Series* of this firm is Prof. Joynes' edition of 'French Fairy Tales.' Here the editor has brought together five stories of Perrault, which are best known in English, one of Mme. d'Aulnoy and two by Mme. Leprince de Beaumont. The purpose of the collection is to interest beginners, especially children, in the study of French, and for that end the notes are made very full, covering nearly one third as many pages as the text. They include remarks by the editor on the merits of the tales, grammatical notes and translations of the more difficult passages. Since the book is intended for the first steps in French the editor has made for it a vocabulary, which is to be commended for giving more than one meaning to a word and for showing the use of the various words in combination with others. By this method the advantages of a lexicon are gained. Prof. Joynes calls especial attention to the system, which he employs in the vocabulary, of indicating, by a dash, "not only, as usual, the title word, but also the stem or essential part, or even the whole, of the French word, when identical, or nearly so, with the English equivalent." By this means he hopes to encourage the habit of comparison between French and English words of like derivation. The labors of the editor conclude with a list of the irregular verbs which occur in the text, and a table of their irregular forms. We must acknowledge our obligations, as instructors, to Prof. Joynes for the pains he has taken to make this beginners' book so attractive and so complete in its explanatory features. There is no reason why elementary training should not be as thorough and scientific in itself, as the more advanced. To form good habits of study in his pupils is the aim of the earnest teacher, and systematic editing will aid him greatly in his efforts in this direction. The book is of convenient size: v, 147 pp.; price, 35 cts.

Longmans, Green & Co. (London and New York) have issued the story of Dantès' captivity in the Château d'If under the title of 'Episodes from le Comte de Monte-Cristo par Alexandre Dumas.' The editor, D. B. Kitchin, M.A., publishes portions of the original narrative, and connects them by occasional

summaries in English. He also gives a short biographical notice of Dumas and an introduction to the episode in question. The notes are poor in quality, performing too much the service of the lexicon and the duty of the instructor. An appendix on "Letter-change in the formation of French Words" is based on the English translation of Brachet's Grammar and Etymological Dictionary. The last twenty years of scientific study of the French language are apparently unknown to the editor.

Molière's 'le Misanthrope' is the latest addition to the "French Classics" of the *Clarendon Press Series*. Its editor, H. W. Gegg Markheim, M.A., has made a good study of the surroundings and spirit of the play in his introduction, but has curiously mixed up moral reflections and personal experience with the testimony of the seventeenth century society gossips. The text is preceded by the bookseller's announcement of De Visé's letter on 'le Misanthrope' and the letter itself is printed in full. The notes to the play are separated into two divisions. The first comprises nearly forty pages, and is devoted to historical and literary comments on the passages considered to be worthy of notice. The second division, of five pages, is headed "Translations," but, besides renderings in a rather florid and poetical style, this part contains a few grammatical explanations. The book bears all the evidence of being prepared for special students, whose main object in reading the play would be literature and social history. From this standpoint it is very well made. But instructors could not introduce it safely into the average class-room.

PERSONAL.

Dr. Waller Deering of Vanderbilt University (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. v, p. 31) has been called to the Womans College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, as Professor of Germanic Languages.

Dr. Alexander R. Hohlfeld of Vanderbilt University (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. v, p. 63) has been transferred from the Chair for Romance Languages to that of the Teutonic Languages.

Dr. R. Hochdörfer has been made Alumni Professor of Modern Languages in Wittenberg College (Ohio) in place of Dr. Hugo K. Schilling, called to Harvard University (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. vi, p. 192). Dr. Hochdörfer studied at the universities of Halle and Leipsic, passing the *Staats-Examen* at the latter university in 1881. He received the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Harvard University in 1888. From 1884-86 he was successively teacher of French and German, and Associate Principal of the Classical Academy

at Hallowell (Maine); 1886-90 Instructor in French at Harvard College, since which time he taught German in the Public High Schools and in the Sannett Institute, Boston. He is the editor of Freytag's 'Die Journalisten' (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, pp. 123-124) and the author of an article, "Recent German Publications," published in these columns, 1890.

Dr. Julius Goebel, sometime Associate Editor for the German department of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Literary Editor of the *Belletristisches Journal* of N.Y., has been appointed Associate Professor of German in the Leland Stanford Junior University, California.

Prof. L. Clédat (Faculté des Lettres de Lyon, France) has in preparation a phototype reproduction of the autograph manuscript of the 'Pensées' de Pascal, for which he would be pleased to receive names of subscribers either directly, or through MOD. LANG. NOTES.

Edw. Playfair Anderson was called to Miami University (Ohio) at the opening of the present Academic year as Professor of French and German. Professor Anderson is a graduate (1879) of the University of Michigan, where he received the doctor's degree in 1886, after a special course of two years study. From 1882-84 he was professor of Latin, French, and English Literature in McMinnville College (Oregon); 1886-87, professor of French and German in the Michigan Military Academy; 1888-89, professor of English Literature and History in Ohio University (Athens); 1889-90, professor of English Literature and Modern Languages in the Michigan Agricultural College.—Professor Anderson has written "What Vergil's Eclogues Owe to the Idyls of Theocritus" (Thesis, 1886); frequent articles (both signed and unsigned) for the monthly journal, the *Dial* (Chicago); the Introduction and notes to 'The Best Letters of Madame de Sévigné,' which he edited; and in connection with Professor Melville B. Anderson he was collaborator in the series of American translations entitled *Les Grands Écrivains Français*.

S. J. Brun has been appointed Instructor in French at Leland Stanford Junior University (California). Mr. Brun had his early training in the *Lycée* of Nîmes; in 1876 he received the degree *Bachelier ès-Sciences* at the *Faculté des Sciences* of Montpellier; in 1881-82, was Instructor in French at Haverford College (Pennsylvania); in 1882-86, Instructor in French in the Cornell University (New York). In collaboration with Professor T. F. Crane of the latter University, he published 'Tableaux de la Révolution Française.'

Ernst Voss has been appointed Instructor in German at the University of Michigan. Mr.

Voss has studied at the Universities of Rostock and Marburg; he came to America in 1889; in 1890 he presented a paper entitled "German Secondary Schools" before the Schoolmasters' Club of Michigan, and has now in preparation a monograph on the School system of Switzerland.

OBITUARY.

BERNHARD TEN BRINK.

On May 1, 1890, Professor ten Brink entered upon his duties as Rector of Strasburg University for the ensuing year. The address which he delivered upon that occasion gave to his colleagues an opportunity to test the quality of his mind, and it attracted general attention and praise. On May 1, 1891, as outgoing Rector, he spoke fitting words of eulogy concerning those teachers in the University who had passed away during his term of office. On May Day of this year it fell to Rector Knapp to voice the universal regret for the loss of Professor ten Brink himself. *Sunt lacrimae rerum*.

Bernhard ten Brink was born at Amsterdam, Jan. 12, 1841. He studied Romance philology under Diez at Bonn, and received his doctor's degree in that department. His teacher in English philology was Delius, and this line of study soon became his chief interest. After serving at Münster as a privat-docent, and at Marburg as assistant professor of English, he came in 1873 to the newly revived University of Strasburg. He died at Strasburg, Jan. 29, 1892. Professor Henry Morley gives as the full name of Professor ten Brink, Bernhard Egidius Conrad ten Brink, and says that he died "from poison by the use of an unsafe cooking vessel." His death occurred "only four days before the date named for his daughter's marriage." ('Eng. Writers,' viii, p. 415).

Professor ten Brink published the following works: 'Chaucer Studien' (1870), 'Geschichte der englischen Litteratur' (1. Band, 1877; 2. Band, 1. Hälfte, 1889), 'Chaucers Sprache und Verskunst' (1884), 'Beowulf-Untersuchungen' (1888), 'Ueber die Aufgabe der Litteraturgeschichte' (Rectoratsrede, Strasburg, 1891). Among his contributions to philological publications, I mention only "Ueber den Sommer-nachtstraum" in Bd. xiii of the *Jahrbuch der d. Sh. Gesellschaft*. The first volume of the 'Geschichte' has been translated into English; it was published by Holt & Co., and in Bohn's Library. A translation of the half-volume of 1889, specimen pages of which I saw in manuscript in that year, is at last announced by Holt & Co. as "in preparation." An English scholar, W. Clarke Robinson, Ph. D., is the translator.—The sketch of Old English (A.-S.)

literature for Paul's 'Grundriss' was promised for March of this year, and may have been nearly completed.—Professor ten Brink's lecture notes were systematically arranged, and it may be that, through Dr. Levy of Strasburg, or some other personal friend, some things will now see the light which any less exacting writer would have put forth long ago.—His death takes away the last one of the founders of that valuable series of monographs, 'Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker.' About seventy volumes have appeared in the series since its establishment in 1874.

The eminence of Professor ten Brink in the entire domain of English philology, and his pre-eminence in those portions of the field which received his especial attention, are unquestioned. In the painstaking thoroughness and minute accuracy of his phonetic, linguistic, and grammatic investigations, he was not surpassed by any Dryasdust that ever toiled in those fields. Professor Kluge, in his history of the English language in Paul's 'Grundriss,' says of the Chaucer Grammar:

"Die erste und einzige mittel-englische Grammatik von wissenschaftlicher Bedeutung ist ten Brinks Chaucer-Grammatik die sonst ungekannte Verbindung von germ. und roman. Sprachwissenschaft [ist] hier ungewöhnlich glücklich und erfolgreich, und die Beherrschung sämtlicher engl. Sprachperioden so gleichmässig und breit, dass diese Leistung seit lange mit Recht im Vordergrund der mittel-englischen Studien steht."

Yet the prime interest of Professor ten Brink in the monuments which he studied was literary. If in accurate knowledge of the history of the English language he had few rivals, in acquaintance with the whole field of English literature down to the Restoration he perhaps had none. And everything that he wrote about literature is itself literature. He was never guilty of the fundamental absurdity of those who write about graceful books awkwardly, who contribute reams of harsh and dull writing in order to help their readers to an appreciation of that which is musical and sparkling. Every one of his lectures was, as far as possible, a work of art. Even the most dry and matter-of-fact passages in his books have all the grace of form that the subject admits of. The German language needs such a master in order to show its power.

Professor ten Brink was at his best in literary criticism. Here his broad scholarship, his ready sympathy and fine taste, his clear vision and firm grasp, and his skill as a writer, all came to full expression.

Personally, Professor ten Brink was most genial and kindly, yet always dignified. He had an old-school politeness that was charming. He desired very much to have his own work appreciated; but he had no petty jealousies, and his writings are free from

bitterness and personality. He said once that any man who would read his writings on Chaucer, could anticipate many of the Chaucer "discoveries" of another professor, but the words were spoken without bitterness. A mark of character is found in the fact that he postponed as long as possible his journey through the Cloaca Maxima of our literature, the drama of the Restoration,—and in the fact that the journey could not be omitted. Professor ten Brink was too exacting to attract many students. He demanded perfect work from them, and, of course, was never entirely satisfied. He belonged to a Catholic family and adhered to the faith of his fathers, but was a frank critic of the church. A full and interesting sketch of his personality and work from the pen of his pupil and friend, Dr. George Hempl, may be found in the April number of the *Chicago Dial*.

It is a fortunate thing that Professor ten Brink took for the subject of his Rector's address "The Task of the Historian of Literature." I will close this imperfect tribute to his memory with a few sentences from this address:

"Unsere Anschauungen sind in der Regel viel zu complicirt, als dass wir sie auszudrücken vermöchten; daher greifen wir eine uns besonders stark afficirende Seite, ein auffälliges Merkmal heraus und diesem geben wir Ausdruck in der Hoffnung, dass unser Hörer gleichfalls von dieser Seite her den Gegenstand am leichtesten zu ergreifen vermögen und so—zugleich durch die sinnliche Wirkung der Rede unterstützt—dahin gelangen werde, unsere Anschauung oder doch etwas ihr Aehnliches zu reproduciren."

"Selten aber oder nie kann der Künstler den geistigen Stoff [die Fabel] gerade so brauchen, wie er sich ihm darbietet; denn beinahe niemals entspricht er vollkommen der Idee, welche er darin erkennt oder in ihn hineinlegt. Da übt denn der Dichter sein Recht, die Fabel seinem Zwecke gemäss, d. h. in Uebereinstimmung mit seiner Idee umzugestalten Je tiefer, klarer, machtvoller, in sich vollendeter diese Persönlichkeit [des Dichters] ist, desto glücklicher wird die Gestaltung, die Umformung der Fabel vor sich gehen. Ein unerreichter Meister auf diesem Gebiet, weit mehr noch als auf dem der Composition, ist Shakspere, dessen Grösse sich vor allem in der sicheren Intuition offenbart, womit er die tragischen Momente einer Fabel herausfühlt und herausentwickelt."

"Was Litteraturgeschichte für die litterarische Production bedeuten könne, zeigt uns vor allem die Entwicklung der neueren deutschen Dichtung in dem Verhältniss Herders zu Goethe."

A. H. TOLMAN.

Ripon College.